arXiv:1412.0085v1 [math.LO] 29 Nov 2014

The definability of $\mathbb{E}$ in self-iterable mice

Farmer Schlutzenberg[1]

Abstract

Let M be a fine structural mouse and let $F \in M$ be such that $M \models$"F is an extender" and $(M||\mathrm{lh}(F), F)$ is a premouse. We show that it follows that $F \in \mathbb{E}^M$, where $\mathbb{E}^M$ is the extender sequence of M. We also prove generalizations of this fact.

We then prove that for self-iterable premice M with no largest cardinal, $\mathbb{E}^M$ is definable over the universe $\lfloor M \rfloor$ of M, and $\lfloor M \rfloor \models$"$V = \mathrm{HOD}$".

We also show that there is no iterable bicephalus (N, E, F) for which E is type 2 and F is type 1 or 3. As a corollary, we deduce a uniqueness property for maximal $L[\mathbb{E}]$ constructions computed in iterable background universes.

Keywords: inner model, mouse, extender, sequence, self-iterable, bicephalus
2010 MSC: 03E45, 03E55

1. Introduction

Kunen [1] showed that if $V = L[U]$ where U is a normal measure, then U is the unique normal measure. Mitchell [4, 5] constructed inner models with sequences of measurables and proved similar results regarding these. Schimmerling and Steel [8, §2] also proved related results regarding certified extenders which cohere K or an iterate thereof.

In this paper we will consider certain generalizations of these results to fine-structural mice M below a superstrong cardinal. Let $F \in M$ be such that $M \models$"F is a total, wellfounded extender". We are interested in questions such as:

1. Is F on $\mathbb{E}^M$?
2. Is F the extender of an iteration map on M?[2][3]

We will show in Theorems 3.1-3.6, the central results of the paper, that under further reasonable (but significant) assumptions, the answer (to at least one of the above questions) is in the affirmative, and thus, $\mathbb{E}^M$ is in some sense maximal

Email address: farmer.schlutzenberg@gmail.com (Farmer Schlutzenberg)
[1]Thanks to John Steel for discussions on the topic of this paper.
[2]John Steel suggested this question, under the added assumption that $V = \lfloor M \rfloor$.
[3]Where the iteration map is via a fine structural tree on M, as in [3].

with regard to extenders. The statements of these theorems are analogous to Schimmerling and Steel's results in [8, §2]. The simplest case is as follows. But let us first remark that we use the definition of *premouse* from [18, §2]. These models do not have extenders of superstrong type on their extender sequence. For the central results, this is the only anti-large cardinal hypothesis we require. See also 3.7.

Theorem (3.1)**.** *Let N be a $(0,\omega_1+1)$-iterable premouse. Let $E \in N$ be such that $(N||\mathrm{lh}(E), E)$ is a premouse and E is total over N.*

Then E is on $\mathbb{E}^N$.

Steel first proved a version of 3.1, assuming that $\nu = \nu_E$ is regular in N and that $\mathrm{Ult}(N,E)||\nu = N||\nu$, and assuming some closure of N ($N \models$"there is no largest cardinal" suffices).

Theorems 3.3–3.6 are modifications of 3.1 in which E coheres an iterate of either N or a related premouse, and in 3.6, we relax the requirement that $E \in N$, requiring only that E be definable (from parameters) over N.

Because these results give criteria for an extender E to be on $\mathbb{E}^N$ (or to be on $\mathbb{E}^P$ for an iterate P of N), one might attempt to use them to show that a mouse can recognize its own extender sequence. Given a premouse M, we write $\lfloor M \rfloor$ for the universe of M. Recall that M_n is the canonical proper class inner model with n Woodin cardinals. Steel showed that for $n \leq \omega$, $\lfloor M_n \rfloor \models$"$V = \mathrm{HOD}$", and in fact that $\mathbb{E}(M_n)$ is definable over $\lfloor M_n \rfloor$. Steel's method[4] extends to more complex mice, but precisely how far seems unknown. Using Theorem 3.4 we will prove the following:

Theorem (4.3)**.** *Let N be a premouse with no largest cardinal. Suppose $N \models$"I am fully iterable". Then $\mathbb{E}^N$ is definable over $\lfloor N \rfloor$ and $\lfloor N \rfloor \models$"$V = \mathrm{HOD}$".*

We actually prove a stronger version of the above theorem, in which we don't assume full self-iterability. We will show that this version applies for $M = N|\lambda$, where N is the least non-tame mouse and λ a limit cardinal of N.[5]

Finally, we adapt Mitchell and Steel's "Uniqueness of the next extender" result [3, 9.2] to bicephali B of the form $(|B|, E, F)$, with E type 2 and F type 1 or 3. (Such bicephali were not considered in [3]; it was unnecessary there.) This has positive implications regarding the uniqueness of maximal $L[\mathbb{E}]$-constructions.

The paper proceeds as follows. In §2 we review Dodd condensation of extenders (due to Steel) and prove various related facts. In §3 we state and prove the central results 3.1–3.6, making use of most of the work in §2. We first give the full proof of 3.4, and then describe the modifications needed to prove the other results. There are significant modifications needed only for 3.6, and these

[4]Steel showed that $K^{M_n} = M_n$, which gives the result. Here the definition of K of [17] cannot be used directly because of the existence of Woodin cardinals; it is applied in the intervals between consecutive Woodins.

[5]The method fails for non-tame mice, because of a lack of self-iterability (see 4.7).

are all fine-structural. In §4 we consider, for premice N, the definability of $\mathbb{E}^N$ over $\lfloor N \rfloor$. This section uses only Theorem 3.4 from §3, and in particular, not Theorem 3.6, nor the material on coding of iteration trees in §3. Finally, §5 is on bicephali. This section depends a little on §2, but not at all on §§3,4.

The material in §§2-4 due to the author is taken primarily from the author's dissertation [14], but with various refinements having been incorporated.

1.1. Conventions and Notation

$\mathcal{H}_\nu$ denotes the set of sets hereditarily of size less than $\nu \in \mathrm{OR}$. For an extensional H, $\mathrm{tr}(H)$ denotes the transitive collapse of H. We use the lexicographic order on $\mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$: $a <_{\mathrm{lex}} b$ iff $\max(a \Delta b) \in b$.

Given a rudimentarily closed transitive set M, we use the term *pre-extender over* M as in [18], except that we also include long extenders. We use *pre-extender* to mean "pre-extender over some M", and *extender* (*over*) to mean *pre-extender* (*over*). Thus, after this sentence, we always explicitly state assumptions on the completeness or wellfoundedness of pre-extenders, and discard "pre-" from "pre-extender". So an extender E is over M iff there is an ordinal $\delta \leq \mathrm{OR}^M$ such that E measures exactly the sets in $M \cap \bigcup_{\alpha<\delta} \mathcal{P}(\alpha^{<\omega})$. In this case we call δ the *domain* of E, denoted $d(E)$. An extender is *total* if it is over V.

All extenders E we use have support, denoted $\mathrm{spt}(E)$, of the form $X = \gamma \cup q$ for some $(\gamma, q) \in \mathrm{OR} \times \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$. Let E be an extender over N. Then $\nu(E)$ is the natural length of E, and if E is (equivalent to) the active extender of a premouse N, then $\mathrm{lh}(E)$ denotes OR^N. For $X \subseteq \mathrm{spt}(E)$, $E \restriction X$ is the sub-extender using only coordinates in X. The ultrapower embedding $N \to \mathrm{Ult}(N, E)$, or $N \to \mathrm{Ult}_k(N, E)$, depending on context, is denoted i^N_E or i_E. The notation $\mathrm{Ult}_k(E, F)$, for F an extender, and $\circ_k$, is introduced in 2.21.

Premice are as in [18]. For P a premouse, $\lfloor P \rfloor$ is the universe of P, F^P is the active extender of P, $\tilde{F^P}$ is the amenable coding of F^P as in [18, 2.9–2.10], $\mathbb{E}^P$ is the extender sequence of P, excluding F^P, and $\mathbb{E}^P_+$ is $\mathbb{E}^P \frown F^P$. If P has a largest cardinal it is denoted by $\mathrm{lgcd}(P)$ or δ^P. Notation is likewise for segmented-premice; see 2.8. The $\tilde{F}$ notation is also used a little more generally, in a similar way. Let $\alpha \leq \mathrm{OR}^P$ be a limit ordinal. Then $P|\alpha \trianglelefteq P$ and $\mathrm{OR}^{P|\alpha} = \alpha$; and $P||\alpha = (\lfloor Q \rfloor, \mathbb{E}^Q, \emptyset)$ where $Q = P|\alpha$. If P is active, $\nu(P) = \nu(F^P)$. *ISC* abbreviates "initial segment condition".

For definability over premice, we use the $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_n$ hierarchy as in [18]. Let $n < \omega$, let P be an n-sound premouse, and let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_0(P)$. Let H be the set of points in $\mathfrak{C}_0(P)$ definable over $\mathfrak{C}_0(P)$ with a generalized $r\Sigma_{n+1}$ term from parameters in $X \cup \{u^P_n\}$ (cf. [3, 2.8.1]). Then $\mathrm{Hull}^P_{n+1}(X)$ is the structure $(H, H \cap \mathbb{E}^{\mathfrak{C}_0(P)}, H \cap F^{\mathfrak{C}_0(P)})$, and $\mathrm{cHull}^P_{n+1}(X)$ is its transitive collapse. We may occasionally identify a type 3 premouse with its squash, so in particular, if P is type 3, then we might write $\mathrm{cHull}^P_{n+1}(X)$ where we really mean $\mathrm{cHull}^P_{n+1}(X)^{\mathrm{unsq}}$. We define $\mathrm{Hull}^P_\omega(X)$ and $\mathrm{cHull}^P_\omega(X)$ similarly. For any premouse P, and $\delta \in \mathrm{OR}$, the δ-core of P is $\mathfrak{C}_\omega(P)$ if $\rho^{N_\alpha}_\omega \geq \delta$, and is $\mathrm{cHull}^{\mathfrak{C}_n(P)}_{n+1}(\delta \cup \{p^{\mathfrak{C}_n(P)}_{n+1}\})$, if $n < \omega$ is

such that $\rho_{n+1}^{Q'} < \delta \leq \rho_n^{Q'}$. Also, $\mathrm{Th}_{n+1}^P(X)$ and $\mathrm{pTh}_{n+1}^P(X)$ respectively denote the generalized and pure $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ theories of $\mathfrak{C}_0(P)$ in parameters in $X \cup \{u_n^P\}$.

Given an iteration tree $\mathcal{T}$, we write $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{T}}$ for the model to which $E_\alpha^\mathcal{T}$ applies after any drop in model, and $i_{\alpha+1,\beta}^{*\mathcal{T}} : M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{T}} \to M_\beta^\mathcal{T}$ for the canonical embedding, if it exists; $\kappa_\alpha^\mathcal{T} = \mathrm{cr}(E_\alpha^\mathcal{T})$, $\nu_\alpha^\mathcal{T} = \nu(E_\alpha^\mathcal{T})$, $\mathrm{lh}_\alpha^\mathcal{T} = \mathrm{lh}(E_\alpha^\mathcal{T})$; if $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T}) = \theta + 1$, then $\mathcal{N}^\mathcal{T} = M_\theta^\mathcal{T}$, $b^\mathcal{T} = [0,\theta]_\mathcal{T}$, and if there is no drop on $b^\mathcal{T}$, then $i^\mathcal{T} = i_{0,\theta}^\mathcal{T}$. We say $\mathcal{T}$ is *above* ρ iff $\rho \leq \mathrm{cr}(E_\alpha^\mathcal{T})$ for each $\alpha + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$. Σ is an η-iteration strategy for a premouse P *above* ρ if Σ works as an iteration strategy as applied to trees on P, above ρ, of length $\leq \eta$. $\Phi(\mathcal{T})$ is the phalanx associated to $\mathcal{T}$ (see [17]). Whenever we use the term *maximal* with regard to an iteration tree, we mean it in the sense of *k-maximal* (for the appropriate k).

Given a phalanx $\mathfrak{P}$, premouse N, $k < \omega$ and $\eta \in \mathrm{OR}$, we write $\mathfrak{P}^\frown \langle(\nu, N, k, \lambda)\rangle$ for the phalanx extending $\mathfrak{P}$ with the model N, and where *normal* iteration trees $\mathcal{U}$ must satisfy: the exchange ordinal for N is ν (i.e. $E_\alpha^\mathcal{U}$ applies to a model of $\mathfrak{P}$ iff $\mathrm{cr}(E_\alpha^\mathcal{U}) < \nu$); $\deg^\mathfrak{P}(N) = k$ (i.e. if $E_\alpha^\mathcal{U}$ applies to N and $\mathrm{cr}(E_\alpha^\mathcal{U}) < \rho_k^N$ then $\deg^\mathcal{U}(\alpha+1) = k$); $\lambda \leq \mathrm{lh}(E_0^\mathcal{U})$.

2. Dodd structure

The proof of 3.1-3.6 will involve the analysis of a comparison. In the case that E is type 2, we will need to deal with the possibility that generators of E are moved by the iteration map resulting from comparison. For this, we analyze how those generators are moved. This section gives us the tools for this analysis. In the case that E is type 1 or type 3, the comparison analysis is standard and does not depend on §2 at all. Parts of §2 are also needed in §5, but the reader interested only in §5 would probably save time by starting there and referring to §2 as needed.

We begin by surveying some definitions and notation. These definitions are from, or are slight variants of definitions from, [3] and [6]. However, when considering Dodd condensation we do not quite require E to be short.

Definition 2.1 (Generators; Dodd condensation)**.** An extender E over P is *standard* iff $\mathrm{spt}(E) \in \mathrm{OR}$ and $\alpha = [\{\alpha\}, \mathrm{id}]_E^P$ for every $\alpha \in \mathrm{spt}(E)$. Let E over P be such. Let $X \subseteq \mathrm{spt}(E)$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{OR}$; then α is *generated by X* (with respect to E) iff there are $f \in P$ and $a \in X^{<\omega}$ such that $\alpha = [a, f]_E^P$. We say that X *generates* E iff every $\alpha \in \mathrm{spt}(E)$ is generated by X. We write $E \approx E \restriction X$ iff X generates E.[6] For $t \in \mathrm{spt}(E)^{<\omega}$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{OR}$ we say that α is a *t-generator* iff α is not generated by $\alpha \cup t$. Let $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(E)$. If E is short, $\tau \in \mathrm{OR}$ and $t \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$, "$E \restriction (\tau \cup t)$" denotes the natural coding of $E \restriction (\tau \cup t)$ as a subset of $(\mathcal{P}(\kappa^{<\omega}) \cap P) \times \tau^{<\omega}$, as in [6, §3].

We say E is *semi-close* to P iff $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap P = \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathrm{Ult}(P, E)$.

Suppose E is semi-close to P and $E \restriction i_E(\kappa) \notin \mathrm{Ult}(M, E)$. We define $k < \omega$ and the *Dodd parameter* $t_E = t(E) = \{t_0 > \ldots > t_{k-1}\} \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$, and *Dodd*

[6] We will only use such notation when $X = \tau \cup t$ for some $\tau \in \mathrm{OR}$ and $t \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$.

projectum $\tau_E = \tau(E) \in \mathrm{OR}$, of E. Given $t_E \restriction i = \{t_0, \ldots, t_{i-1}\}$, t_i is the largest $t_E \restriction i$-generator α of E such that $\alpha \geq (\kappa^+)^P$. Notice $t_i < t_{i-1}$. Then $k = \mathrm{lh}(t)$ is as large as possible and τ_E is the sup of $(\kappa^+)^P$ and all t_E-generators of E.

We say E is *Dodd-sound* iff for each $i < \mathrm{lh}(t_E)$, $E \restriction (t_i \cup t_E \restriction i) \in \mathrm{Ult}(P, E)$, and if $\tau_E > (\kappa^+)^P$ then for each $\alpha < \tau_E$, $E \restriction (\alpha \cup t_E) \in \mathrm{Ult}(P, E)$.

Now let F be any extender. Let E be the equivalent standard extender, derived from i_F, of support $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathrm{spt}(F)}([\{\alpha\}, \mathrm{id}]^P_E + 1)$. We apply the preceding terminology to F in two ways, depending on context: (a) applying it literally to E (for example, "X generates α" would apply to a set X iff $X \subseteq \mathrm{spt}(E)$, even if $\mathrm{spt}(E) \not\subseteq \mathrm{spt}(F)$); (b) dealing directly with $X \subseteq \mathrm{spt}(F)$, as with the notation "$F \restriction X$" introduced earlier. $\dashv$

The first fact below is straightforward to prove; see [6, 3.1].

Fact 2.2. *Let E be an extender. Let $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(E)$. Then τ_E is the least $\tau \geq (\kappa^+)^E$ such that there is $t \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$ with $\tau \cup t$ generating E. Moreover, t_E is the least $t \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$ witnessing this fact. In particular, $E \approx E \restriction \tau_E \cup t_E$.*

If $\tau_E > (\kappa^+)^E$ then E is not finitely generated. If $\tau_E > (\kappa^+)^E$ and $\tau_E \in \mathrm{wfp}(\mathrm{Ult}(P, E))$ then τ_E is a cardinal of $\mathrm{Ult}(P, E)$. If $\tau_E = (\kappa^+)^E$ then E is generated by $t_E \cup \{\mathrm{cr}(E)\}$.

Fact 2.3 (Steel, [6, 3.2],[11, 4.1])**.** *Let P be an active, 1-sound, $(0, \omega_1, \omega_1 + 1)$-iterable premouse. Then F^P is Dodd-sound.*

Remark 2.4. Let (P, E) be a premouse, with $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(E)$. If $\tau_E = (\kappa^+)^E$, then $E \approx E \restriction t_E \notin \mathrm{Ult}(P, E)$, so the definition of Dodd-soundness is optimal. For it's standard that $\{\kappa\}$ generates $(\kappa^+)^E$, so $E \approx E \restriction t_E \cup \{\kappa\}$, so it suffices to see that κ is generated by $\{\gamma\}$ for every $\gamma \in [\kappa, i_E(\kappa))$.

So fix $\gamma \in [\kappa, i_E(\kappa))$. By [18, Claim 2 of proof of 8.27], we may fix $f \in P \cap {}^\kappa\kappa$ such that $\gamma \leq i_E(f)(\kappa) < i_E(\kappa)$. Define $g : \kappa \to \kappa$ by letting $g(\alpha)$ be the least β such that $\beta = \alpha$ or $f(\beta) \geq \alpha$. Then $g \in P$ and $i_E(g)(\gamma) = \kappa$.

We now introduce a variant of the Dodd parameter and projectum, more analogous to the standard parameter and projectum.

Definition 2.5. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the class of pairs $(s, \sigma) \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega} \times \mathrm{OR}$ such that if $s \neq \emptyset$ then $\sigma \leq \min(s)$. We extend $<_{\mathrm{lex}}$ to wellorder $\mathcal{D}$ in the natural way. Let $(s_1, \sigma_1) <_{\mathrm{lex}} (s_2, \sigma_2)$ iff, treating s_1, s_2 as strictly decreasing sequences, either $s_1 \mathbin{^\frown} \langle \sigma_1 \rangle \subseteq s_2$ or there's $i \leq \mathrm{lh}(s_1)$ such that $s_1 \restriction i = s_2 \restriction i$ and $(s_1 \mathbin{^\frown} \langle \sigma_1 \rangle)(i) < (s_2 \mathbin{^\frown} \langle \sigma_2 \rangle)(i)$. $\dashv$

Definition 2.6. Let $\pi : R \to S$ be Σ_0-elementary between premice. Suppose π is cardinal preserving, $\mu = \mathrm{cr}(\pi)$ is inaccessible in R and $R|(\mu^+)^R = S|(\mu^+)^S$. Suppose $E_\pi \notin S$, where E_π is the extender derived from π of length $\pi(\mu)$.

The *Dodd-fragment parameter, projectum* (s_π, σ_π) of π is the $<_{\mathrm{lex}}$-least $(s, \sigma) \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\sigma \geq (\mu^+)^R$ and $E_\pi \restriction (\sigma \cup s) \notin S$.

If F is an extender, $S = \mathrm{Ult}(R, F)$ and $\pi = i_F$, let (s_F, σ_F) denote (s_π, σ_π). Given a premouse P with $F^P \neq \emptyset$, let (s_P, σ_P) denote (s_{F^P}, σ_{F^P}).

The *Dodd-fragment ordinals* of π (or of F, or of P) are s_π, σ_π (or s_F, σ_F, or s_P, σ_P). $\dashv$

Remark 2.7. With notation as above, suppose $E_\pi \notin S$.

Let $\pi' : R \to \mathrm{Ult}(R, E_\pi)$ be the ultrapower map. Then $(s_{\pi'}, \sigma_{\pi'}) = (s_\pi, \sigma_\pi)$.

Let F be a (possibly long) extender derived from π with $E_\pi \subseteq F$. Then (s_F, σ_F) is defined and $(s_\pi, \sigma_\pi) = (s_F, \sigma_F) \leq_{\mathrm{lex}} (t_F, \tau_F)$, since $E_\pi \notin \mathrm{Ult}(N, F)$ and $\tau_F \cup t_F$ generates F. Moreover, F is Dodd sound iff $(s_F, \sigma_F) = (t_F, \tau_F)$.

We have a characterization of s_π, σ_π, analogous to the definition of the Dodd parameter and projectum. Let $s = \langle s_0, \ldots, s_{l-1} \rangle \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$ be the longest possible sequence such that for each $i < l$, s_i is the largest $\alpha \geq (\mu^+)^R$ such that $E_\pi \restriction (\alpha \cup s \restriction i) \in S$. (Note $s_{i+1} < s_i$.) Then $s_\pi = s$ and σ_π is the sup of $(\mu^+)^R$ and all α such that $E_\pi \restriction (\alpha \cup s_\pi) \in S$. We omit the proof.

In §5 we apply some of the results of §2 to structures which aren't premice. For example, we will deal with structures of the form $\mathrm{Ult}(P, H)$, where P is type 3 and $\mathrm{cr}(H) = \nu_P$ (computing the ultrapower without squashing P). See [3, §9]. We now set up terminology in relation to this.

Definition 2.8. We say that M is a *segmented-premouse* iff either (a) M is a passive premouse, or (b) there are $N, F, \tilde{F}$ such that:

1. $M = (N, \tilde{F})$,
2. N is a passive premouse,
3. N has a largest cardinal δ,
4. F is a short extender over N of length OR^N,
5. $\nu(F) \leq \delta$,
6. $\mathrm{OR}^N = (\delta^+)^{\mathrm{Ult}(N,F)}$,
7. $N = \mathrm{Ult}(N, F)|\mathrm{OR}^N$, and
8. $\tilde{F}$ is the amenable coding of F as in [18, 2.9–2.10], but with δ used in place of $\nu(F)$; that is, $\tilde{F}$ is the set of all tuples (γ, ξ, a, x) such that $\mathrm{cr}(F) < \xi < (\mathrm{cr}(F)^+)^N$ and $\delta < \gamma < \mathrm{OR}^N$ and letting $F' = F \cap (N|\xi \times \delta^{<\omega})$, we have $F' \in N|\gamma$ and $(a, x) \in F'$.

A segmented-premouse which is not a premouse is *proper*. ⊣

Remark 2.9. Premice are segmented-premice. However, active segmented-premice P can fail the ISC, and we can have $\nu(F^P) < \mathrm{lgcd}(P)$. Proper segmented-premice can arise, for example, from taking ultrapowers of type 3 premice at the unsquashed level. When dealing with fine structure for proper segmented-premice P, we only deal with degree 0, i.e. we only define $\rho_0 = \mathrm{OR}(P)$, and 0-soundness (which holds automatically), and ultrapowers of P are always degree 0, and formed without squashing. Moreover, whenever we form $U = \mathrm{Ult}_0(P, E)$ for an active segmented-premouse P, without squashing P, then we define $\tilde{F^U} = i_E{}^{\text{“}}\tilde{F^P}$.

Lemma 2.10. *Let P be an active segmented-premouse, $F = F^P$, and H a (possibly long) extender over P. Let $W = \mathrm{Ult}_0(P, H)$. Let $A_H \subseteq \mathrm{lh}(H)$ generate H and $A_F \subseteq \mathrm{lh}(F)$ generate F. Then (a) $A_H \cup i_H$"A_F generates F^W.*

Suppose further that $\mathrm{cr}(F^P) < \mathrm{cr}(H)$. Let G_H be the set of generators of H and G_F those of F. Then (b) the set of generators of F^W is $G_H \cup i_H$"G_F.

Proof. Part (a). This is proven like [3, 9.1]: Let $\alpha < \nu(F^W)$. Let

$$\psi : \mathrm{Ult}_0(P, F) \to \mathrm{Ult}_0(W, F^W)$$

be the map induced by i_H. Let $f \in P$ and $\bar\beta \in A_H^{<\omega}$ be such that $\alpha = i_H(f)(\bar\beta)$. Let $g \in P$ and $\bar\gamma \in A_F^{<\omega}$ be such that $f = i_F(g)(\bar\gamma)$. Let $\bar\gamma^* = i_H(\bar\gamma)$. Then α is generated by $\bar\beta \cup \bar\gamma^*$. For $\psi \restriction P = i_H$ and $\psi \circ i_F = i_{F^W} \circ i_H$, and therefore

$$\alpha = \psi(f)(\bar\beta) = \psi(i_F(g)(\bar\gamma))(\bar\beta) = i_{F^W}(i_H(g))(\bar\gamma^*)(\bar\beta).$$

Part (b). The generators of F^W in $\mathrm{rg}(i_H)$ are exactly i_H"G_F, since being a generator is an $\mathrm{r}\Pi_1$ property. By (a), $G_H \cup i_H$"G_F generates F^W. So let $\alpha \in G_H$; we just need to see that α is a generator of F^W. Suppose not. Let $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(F^W)$ and fix $a \in \alpha^{<\omega}$ and $f : \kappa^{|a|} \to \kappa$ with $f \in W$, such that $i_{F^W}(f)(a) = \alpha$. Let $\mu \in P$ be such that $i_H(\mu) > \alpha$. Let

$$g = i_{F^P}(f) \cap \mu^{|a|} \times \mu.$$

Then

$$i_{F^W}(f) \cap i_H(\mu)^{|a|} \times i_H(\mu) = i_H(g),$$

so $i_H(g)(a) = \alpha$, contradiction. □

Lemma 2.11 below is essentially [2, 2.1.4]. It can be proven from 2.10, using that $\tau_F \cup t_F$ generates F, and, by $\mathrm{r}\Pi_1$-elementarity, that i_H sends total fragments of F to total fragments of F^W.

Lemma 2.11. *Let P, F, H, W, i_H be as in 2.10, with $d(H) \leq \tau_F$[7]. Assume that F is Dodd sound. Then F^W is Dodd sound. Moreover, $t_{F^W} = i_H(t_F)$ and $\tau_{F^W} = \sup(i_H$"$\tau_F)$.*

Lemma 2.12. *Let P, F, H, W, i_H be as in 2.10. Assume $\sigma_F \leq \mathrm{cr}(H)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_F) \cap P = \mathcal{P}(\sigma_F) \cap W$. Then F^W is* not *Dodd sound. Moreover, $s_{F^W} = i_H(s_F)$ and $\sigma_{F^W} = \sigma_F$.*

Proof. We have $(s_{F^W}, \sigma_{F^W}) \geq_{\mathrm{lex}} (i_H(s_F), \sigma_F)$ as i_H maps fragments of F to fragments of F^W. As $\sigma_F \leq \mathrm{cr}(H)$,

$$F^W \restriction \sigma_F \cup i_H(s_F) \approx F \restriction (\sigma_F \cup s_F),$$

and the latter extender is coded in $\mathcal{P}(\sigma_F) \backslash P = \mathcal{P}(\sigma_F) \backslash W$, so the former is not in W. But as in the proof of 2.10(b), $\mathrm{cr}(H)$ is an $i_H(s_F)$-generator of F^W, so F^W is not Dodd sound. □

[7] So H only measures bounded subsets of τ_F.

The proof of 2.13 below is similar to that of [6, 4.4]. Moreover, 2.14 improves the conclusion of [6, 4.4] to $0 = 1$.

Lemma 2.13. *Let P be a type 2 premouse, $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(F)$, and $X \subseteq \nu^P$. Let*

$$\Lambda = \{x \in P \mid \exists f \in P, a \in X^{<\omega}\, [x = [a, f]_F^P]\}.$$

Suppose $\nu^P, \gamma^P \in \Lambda$ (notation is as in [3]). Then $\Lambda = \mathrm{Hull}_1^P(X \cup (\kappa^+)^P)$.

Proof. Clearly $\kappa \cup X \subseteq \Lambda \subseteq H = \mathrm{Hull}_1^P(X \cup (\kappa^+)^P)$. Let us show $H \subseteq \Lambda$. We have $\kappa \in \Lambda$ by the argument in 2.4. So $(\kappa^+)^P \subseteq \Lambda$.

Let $F^* = F \restriction \Lambda$ and $R = \mathrm{Ult}(P|(\kappa^+)^P, F^*)$. Let

$$\tilde{\pi} : R \to \mathrm{Ult}(P|(\kappa^+)^P, F)$$

be the factor map. Let $\tilde{\pi}(\nu) = \nu^P$. So $\tilde{\pi}((\nu^+)^R) = \mathrm{OR}^P$. Let F' be the transitive collapse of F^*. Let $P' = (R|(\nu^+)^R, \tilde{F'})$, where $\tilde{F'}$ codes F' as in [18, 2.9-2.10], but replacing α, E_α and $\nu(E_\alpha)$ there with $(\nu^+)^R$, F' and ν respectively. Let $\pi : P' \to P$ be the restriction of $\tilde{\pi}$. So $\Lambda = \mathrm{rg}(\pi)$. Let $\gamma^{P'} = \pi^{-1}(\gamma^P)$, $\nu^{P'} = \nu$, $\mu^{P'} = \kappa$. We claim π is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_1$-elementary (so P' is a premouse). This will complete the proof.

Now $\tilde{\pi} \circ i_{F'} = i_F$. So for $A \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa^{<\omega}) \cap P$ and $\gamma < \mathrm{OR}^{P'}$, we have

$$\pi(i_{F'}(A) \cap \gamma^{<\omega}) = i_F(A) \cap \pi(\gamma^{<\omega}).$$

So $\pi\text{“}\tilde{F'} \subseteq \tilde{F^P}$. Since $\pi \restriction (\kappa^+)^P = \mathrm{id}$, [18, 2.9] shows that π is cofinal in P. So π is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_1$-elementary. □

Corollary 2.14. *Let P be a type 2, Dodd sound premouse, and $\mu = \mathrm{cr}(F^P)$. Then $\tau_P = \max(\rho_1^P, (\mu^+)^P)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\tau_P > \gamma = \rho_1^P \cup (\mu^+)^P$. Let $X = \gamma \cup q$, where $q \in \mathrm{OR}(P)^{<\omega}$ is such that $p_1^P, \nu^P, \gamma^P \in \mathrm{Hull}_1^P(\{q\})$. So $F^P \restriction X \in P$, so

$$\mathrm{Ult}(P|(\mu^+)^P, F^P \restriction X) \in P,$$

so by 2.13, $\mathrm{cHull}_1^P(X) \in P$, so $\mathrm{Th}_1^P(\rho_1^P \cup \{p_1^P\}) \in P$, contradiction. □

Lemma 2.15. *Let $k \geq 1$ and let P be a k-sound, type 2, Dodd sound premouse. Let H be a short extender, semi-close to P, with $\mathrm{cr}(H) < \rho_k^P$ and $R = \mathrm{Ult}_k(P, H)$ wellfounded.*

Then R is Dodd sound. Moreover, $t_R = i_H(t_P)$.

If $\tau_P = ((\mu^P)^+)^P$ or $k > 1$ then $\tau_R = i_H(\tau_P)$.

If $k = 1$ then $\tau_R = \sup i_H\text{“}\tau_P$.

Proof. [8] If $k > 1$, elementarity considerations give the lemma.

[8] If R is $(0, \omega_1, \omega_1 + 1)$-iterable, then the Dodd soundness of R follows 2.3. But we need a proof that avoids this assumption, as we'll apply it where R is obtained as an iterate of P, via a strategy that, abstractly, we won't know is an $(\omega, \omega_1, \omega_1 + 1)$-strategy.

Suppose $k = 1$. Let $F = F^P$, $\mu = \mu^P$, $t = t_F$ and $\tau = \tau_F$. Now i_H maps fragments of F to fragments of F^R by elementarity.

Suppose $\tau = (\mu^+)^P$. Then F is generated by $t \cup \{\mu\}$, an $\mathrm{r}\Pi_2$ condition, preserved by i_H, so R is Dodd sound. Moreover, i_H is continuous at $(\mu^+)^P$, since there is no $\mathrm{r}\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}_1^P$ function singularizing $(\mu^+)^P$ because $\mu < \rho_1^P$.

Now suppose $\tau > (\mu^+)^P$. It remains to see that $i_H(t) \cup \sup i_H$"τ generates F^R. Suppose not. Let $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(H)$. Let $[a, f]$ represent an $i_H(t)$-generator γ for F^R with $\gamma \geq \sup i_H$"τ. Here $f : \kappa^n \to P$ is given by a $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_1^P(\{q\})$ term for some $q \in P$. Since the statement "α is an $i_H(t)$-generator" is $\mathrm{r}\Pi_1$, $\mathrm{rg}(f)$ includes a τ-cofinal set of t-generators. This contradicts 2.13 applied with $X = \lambda \cup t$, where $\lambda < \tau$ is large enough that $\mu, q, \nu^P, \gamma^P \in \Lambda$, with Λ as in 2.13. □

For the iteration trees $\mathcal{U}$ we will encounter, $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha$ will always be semi-close to $M^{*\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha+1}$, but ostensibly may not be close. We now show that semi-closeness gives a little more fine structural preservation than was established in [3]. The argument is related to that for [3, 6.2(Claim 5)] (though there, the extenders were always close to the relevant models), and to some of the preceding lemmas.

Definition 2.16. Let N be a k-sound premouse. The $(k+1)$-*solidity parameter, projectum* of N, denoted $(z^N_{k+1}, \zeta^N_{k+1})$, is the $<_{\mathrm{lex}}$-least pair $(z, \zeta) \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathrm{Th}^N_{k+1}(\zeta \cup \{z\}) \notin N$. (See 2.5.) ⊣

Remark 2.17. By [3, 2.10], one can equivalently replace "Th" in 2.16 with "pTh". The author does not know an example, but it seems that ζ^N_{k+1} might fail to be a cardinal of N. However, the following facts follow easily from the definition; let $(z, \zeta) = (z^N_{k+1}, \zeta^N_{k+1})$ and $(p, \rho) = (p^N_{k+1}, \rho^N_{k+1})$:

- There is a characterization of (z, ζ) like that of the Dodd-solidity ordinals in 2.7.
- We may have $\zeta = 0$, but $\zeta \neq \omega$.
- $\rho \leq \max(\omega, \zeta) \leq \rho^N_k$.
- $(z, \zeta) \leq_{\mathrm{lex}} (p, \rho)$.
- N is $(k+1)$-solid iff $p = z$ iff $\rho = \max(\omega, \zeta)$.
- N is $(k+1)$-sound iff $N = \mathrm{Hull}^N_{k+1}(\zeta \cup z)$.

(To see that the last item follows from the others, suppose $N = \mathrm{Hull}^N_{k+1}(\zeta \cup z)$ but $\rho < \zeta$. Note that $p = z \cup q$ for some $q \subseteq [\rho, \zeta)$ with $q \neq \emptyset$. But $(p \cup q, \rho) <_{\mathrm{lex}} (z, \zeta)$, a contradiction.)

Lemma 2.18. *Let N be a k-sound premouse. Let E be a short extender semi-close to N with $\mathrm{cr}(E) < \rho^N_k$. Let $U = \mathrm{Ult}_k(N, E)$. Then $z^U_{k+1} = i_E(z^N_{k+1})$ and $\zeta^U_{k+1} = \sup i_E$"ζ^N_{k+1}.*

Proof. Let $(z,\zeta) = (z^N_{k+1}, \zeta^N_{k+1})$ and $\zeta' = \sup i_E\text{“}\zeta$.

First observe that $(i_E(z),\zeta') \leq_{\text{lex}} (z^U_{k+1}, \zeta^U_{k+1})$. For if $(a,\alpha) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\text{Th}^N_{k+1}(\alpha \cup \{a\}) \in N$, then

$$\text{Th}^U_{k+1}(i_E(\alpha) \cup \{i_E(a)\}) \in U.$$

This follows the proof of [3, 4.6].

It remains to see that

$$t' = \text{pTh}^U_{k+1}(\zeta' \cup \{i_E(z)\}) \notin U. \tag{1}$$

Suppose $t' \in U$. We will show

$$t = \text{pTh}^N_{k+1}(\zeta \cup \{z\}) \in N$$

for a contradiction.

Let $\kappa = \text{cr}(E)$. If $\kappa \geq \zeta^N_{k+1}$ then $t \approx t'$ (exchanging z with $i_E(z)$) by the $\text{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$-elementarity of i_E. So by semi-closeness, $t \in N$. (Cf. 2.12.)

So $\kappa < \zeta^N_{k+1}$. Also, $\zeta^N_{k+1} < \rho^N_k$. For otherwise $\zeta^N_{k+1} = \rho^N_k$. But

$$\text{pTh}^N_{k+1}(\rho^N_k) \notin N$$

(since pTh_{k+1} is given access to the parameters p^N_k, u^N_{k-1}), so $z^N_{k+1} = \emptyset$, and $\rho^U_k = \zeta'$, so

$$t' = \text{pTh}^U_{k+1}(\rho^U_k) \notin U,$$

contradiction.

Since $\zeta^N_{k+1} < \rho^N_k$ there is $f \in N$ such that $f : \kappa^{<\omega} \to N$, and $a \in \text{lh}(E)^{<\omega}$, such that $t' = [a,f]^N_E$. We will compute t from f, giving $t \in N$. We may assume that for each x, $f(x)$ is a set of $\text{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ formulas in parameters in $\alpha \cup \{z, u^N_k\}$, for some $\alpha \leq \zeta$.

For $\alpha < \zeta$, let

$$t^N_\alpha = \text{pTh}^N_{k+1}(\alpha \cup \{z\})$$

and let $f_\alpha : \kappa^{|a|} \to N$ be defined

$$f_\alpha(x) = f(x) \restriction \alpha \cup \{z, u_k\}$$

(the "$\restriction$" symbol means that the theory's parameters are restricted). For $\alpha < \zeta'$, let

$$t^U_\alpha = \text{pTh}^U_{k+1}(\alpha \cup \{i_E(z)\}).$$

Case 1. For each $\alpha < \zeta$, $i_E(t^N_\alpha) = t^U_{i_E(\alpha)}$.

We leave this case to the reader; it is simpler than the next one.

Case 2. For some $\gamma < \zeta$, $i_E(t^N_\gamma) \neq t^U_{i_E(\gamma)}$.

Fix such a γ. Let $<^*$ be the prewellorder on $\mathrm{pTh}^N_{k+1}(N)$ defined in [3, Proof of 2.10]. It follows that t_γ is cofinal in $<^*$, and that $\mathrm{cof}^N(<^* \restriction t_\gamma) = \kappa$. Let $h \in N$ such that $h : \kappa \to t_\gamma$ and h is cofinal, increasing and continuous with respect to $<^*$. For $\alpha \in [\gamma, \zeta)$ let $g_\alpha : \kappa \to N$ be defined

$$g_\alpha(\beta) = t_\alpha \restriction^{<^*} h(\beta)$$

(the "$\restriction^{<^*} h(\beta)$" means restriction to formulas of $<^*$-rank $< h(\beta)$). Then $g_\alpha \in N$ and

$$[g_\alpha, \{\kappa\}]^N_E = t^U_{i_E(\alpha)}.$$

Now we may assume $\kappa = \min(a)$. Let $g'_\alpha : \kappa^{|a|} \to N$ be defined

$$g'_\alpha(x) = g_\alpha(\min(x)).$$

So there is $X_\alpha \in E_a$ such that $g'_\alpha \restriction X_\alpha = f_\alpha \restriction X_\alpha$.

Define the relation $R \subseteq \zeta \times (\kappa^{|a|})^2$ by letting $R(\alpha, x_1, x_2)$ iff $\max(x_1) < \min(x_2)$ and $f_\alpha(x_1) \subseteq f_\alpha(x_2)$. So $R \in N$. Define $\psi(\alpha, x_1)$ iff $R(\alpha, x_1, x_2)$ holds for E_a-almost all x_2. Fix $\alpha \in [\gamma, \zeta)$. Note that if $x_1, x_2 \in X_\alpha$ and $\max(x_1) < \min(x_2)$, then $R(\alpha, x_1, x_2)$. So if $x_1 \in X_\alpha$ then $\psi(\alpha, x_1)$. Conversely, if $\psi(\alpha, x_1)$ then there is $x_2 \in X_\alpha$ such that $R(\alpha, x_1, x_2)$, and therefore, every $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ truth asserted by $f_\alpha(x_1)$ is true in N. So let $S_\alpha = \{x_1 \parallel \psi(\alpha, x_1)\}$. Then

$$t_\alpha = \bigcup_{x_1 \in S_\alpha} f_\alpha(x_1).$$

Suppose $\mathrm{cof}^N(\zeta) \leq \kappa$. Fix a cofinal function $g : \kappa \to \zeta$ with $g \in N$ and $\mathrm{rg}(g) \subseteq [\gamma, \zeta)$. Using weak amenability,

$$S' = \{(\beta, x) \parallel \psi(g(\beta), x)\} \in N.$$

But then

$$t = \bigcup_{(\beta,x) \in S'} f_{g(\beta)}(x) \in N.$$

Now suppose $\mathrm{cof}^N(\zeta) > \kappa$. Let R_α be the α-section of R. For $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [\gamma, \zeta)$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, we have $R_{\alpha_2} \subseteq R_{\alpha_1}$. So $R_{\alpha_1} = R_{\alpha_2}$ for all sufficiently large $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 < \zeta$. Fix such an α_1. Then $S = S_\alpha$ is independent of $\alpha \in [\alpha_1, \zeta)$, and $S \in N$ by weak amenability. So let $S' = [\alpha_1, \zeta) \times S$. Then

$$t = \bigcup_{(\alpha,x) \in S'} f_\alpha(x) \in N,$$

completing the proof. $\square$(2.18)

Notation 2.19. Let N be a k-sound segmented-premouse. Let $\mathcal{F} = \langle F_\alpha \rangle_\alpha$ be a sequence of short extenders. Define

$$\mathrm{Ult}_k(N, \mathcal{F} \restriction \alpha) = N_\alpha,$$

where the models N_α are given by the degree k linear iteration based on N, using the extenders in $\mathcal{F}$. That is, $N_0 = N$,

$$N_{\alpha+1} = \mathrm{Ult}_k(N_\alpha, F_\alpha),$$

and we take direct limits at limit α.[9] Write

$$i^N_{\mathcal{F}} : N \to \mathrm{Ult}_k(N, \mathcal{F})$$

for the ultrapower embedding. If N is active, $\mathrm{Ult}_k(F^N, \mathcal{F})$ and $\mathrm{Ult}_k(\mathrm{id}, \langle F^N \rangle \frown \mathcal{F})$ both denote $F(\mathrm{Ult}_k(N, \mathcal{F}))$.

Corollary 2.20. *Let N be a k-sound premouse. Let $\mathcal{F} = \langle F_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha<\lambda}$ be a sequence of short extenders and $N_\alpha = \mathrm{Ult}_k(N, \mathcal{F} \restriction \alpha)$. Suppose that for all α, N_α is wellfounded, $\mathrm{cr}(F_\alpha) < \rho_k(N_\alpha)$ and F_α is semi-close to N_α. Then $z^{N_\lambda}_{k+1} = i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(z^N_{k+1})$ and $\zeta^{N_\lambda}_{k+1} = \sup i^N_{\mathcal{F}}\text{“}\zeta^N_{k+1}$. Therefore if N, N_λ are both $(k+1)$-solid then $\rho^{N_\lambda}_{k+1} = \sup i^N_{\mathcal{F}}\text{“}\rho^N_{k+1}$ and $p^{N_\lambda}_{k+1} = i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(p^N_{k+1})$.*

If N is not $(k+1)$-solid then neither is N_λ.

N_λ is $(k+1)$-sound iff both N is $(k+1)$-sound and for every $\alpha < \lambda$, $\mathrm{cr}(F_\alpha) < \rho^{N_\alpha}_{k+1}$.

Proof. Let $\rho = \rho^N_{k+1}$, $p = p^N_{k+1}$, $\zeta = \zeta^N_{k+1}$, $z = z^N_{k+1}$, $\zeta' = \zeta^{N_\lambda}_{k+1}$ and $z' = z^{N_\lambda}_{k+1}$.

The first paragraph follows by induction on λ, using 2.18 and 2.17. We just verify that the induction does not fail at a limit stage. We do have the necessary theories in N_λ (use generalized solidity witnesses). So suppose

$$t' = \mathrm{Th}^{N_\lambda}_{k+1}(\zeta' \cup z') \in N_\lambda.$$

Let $\alpha < \lambda$ and t^* be such that $i^{N_\alpha}_{\mathcal{F}\restriction[\alpha,\lambda)}(t^*) = t'$. Let $z^* = i^N_{\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha}(z)$ and $\zeta^* = \sup i^N_{\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha}\text{“}\zeta$. Then

$$\mathrm{Th}^{N_\alpha}_{k+1}(\zeta^* \cup z^*) = t^* \in N_\alpha,$$

but $\zeta^* = \zeta^{N_\alpha}_{k+1}$ and $z^* = z^{N_\alpha}_{k+1}$ by induction, a contradiction.

Now suppose that N is not $(k+1)$-solid. Then by 2.17, $\rho < \zeta$. Let $\zeta_{k+1}(q)$ and $z_{k+1}(q)$ be the relativization of the (ζ, z) notions (at degree $k+1$) to theories with a parameter q given. Then the obvious relativizations of all the results go through (i.e., $i(z^N_{k+1}(q)) = z^R_{k+1}(i(q))$ when $i : N \to R$ is an appropriate ultrapower map, etc). Now $\max(\omega, \zeta^N_{k+1}(p)) = \rho$ and $z^N_{k+1}(p) = \emptyset$. So (using the first paragraph)

$$\rho^{N_\lambda}_{k+1} \leq \max(\omega, \zeta^{N_\lambda}_{k+1}(i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(p))) = \max(\omega, \sup i^N_{\mathcal{F}}\text{“}\zeta^N_{k+1}(p)) < \zeta'.$$

So again by 2.17, N_λ is not $(k+1)$-solid.

[9] Here if N_α is illfounded, or F_α is not an extender over N_α, or $\mathrm{cr}(F_\alpha) \geq \rho^{P_\alpha}_k$, then for all $\beta > \alpha$, N_β is undefined.

Now suppose N is not $(k+1)$-sound. Then $N \neq H = \mathrm{Hull}^N_{k+1}(\zeta \cup z)$ by 2.17. Since $\zeta' \leq i_{\mathcal{F}}(\zeta)$ it suffices to show that

$$N_\lambda \neq \mathrm{Hull}^{N_\lambda}_{k+1}(i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(\zeta) \cup z').$$

For this, let $x \in N \backslash H$. We claim

$$i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \notin \mathrm{Hull}^{N_\lambda}_{k+1}(i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(\zeta) \cup z'), \tag{2}$$

which suffices. Now clearly $\zeta < \rho^N_k$ by our assumption. But $H = \bigcup_{\alpha < \rho^N_k} H_\alpha$, where H_α is the set of all $y \in H$ such that the fact that $y \in H$ is demonstrated by some witness coded by the theory $t_\alpha = \mathrm{Th}^N_k(\alpha \cup \{x, z, p^N_k\})$ (where if $k = 0$, this theory should be replaced with the "α^{th}" fragment of $\mathfrak{C}_0(N)$). So fix $\alpha \in (\zeta, \rho^N_k)$ large enough that $x \in \mathrm{Hull}^N_k(\alpha \cup p^N_k)$ (or $x \in t_\alpha$ if $k = 0$). The fact that $x \notin H_\alpha$ is then an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_k$ assertion about (x, t_α). But

$$i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(t_\alpha) = \mathrm{Th}^{N_\lambda}_k(i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha) \cup \{i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(x), z', p^{N_\lambda}_k\}),$$

and $i^N_{\mathcal{F}}$ is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_k$-elementary, so $i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \notin H^{N_\lambda}_{i^N_{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha)}$, where $H^{N_\lambda}_\gamma$ is defined over N_λ in the obvious manner. Since $\rho^{N_\lambda}_k = \sup i^N_{\mathcal{F}}\text{“}\rho^N_k$, line (2) follows. So by 2.17, N_λ is not $(k+1)$-sound.

Now suppose N is $(k+1)$-sound. Let ξ be least such that either $\xi = \lambda$ or $\mathrm{cr}(F_\xi) \geq \rho'$ where $\rho' = \sup i^N_{\mathcal{F}|\xi}\text{“}\rho$. Let $p' = i^N_{\mathcal{F}|\xi}(p)$. Then by standard arguments, $\rho^{N_\xi}_{k+1} = \rho'$, $p^{N_\xi}_{k+1} = p'$ and N_ξ is $(k+1)$-sound. (Alternatively to these standard arguments, use 2.17 and the results above.) So we are done if $\lambda = \xi$. The remaining details in the case that $\lambda > \xi$ are left to the reader. $\square$(2.20)

Remark. The previous result is optimal in the sense that a degree 0 ultrapower of a 1-sound but non-2-sound structure, can be fully sound. For let N be a 1-sound premouse such that for some $\kappa < \lambda < \mathrm{OR}^N$, $N = \mathcal{J}_\kappa(N|\lambda)$ and $\rho^N_1 = \lambda$ and λ is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^N_1(N)$-regular, and suppose there is an extender E semi-close to N with $\mathrm{cr}(E) = \kappa$. Let $U_1 = \mathrm{Ult}_1(N, E)$ and $U_0 = \mathrm{Ult}_0(N, E)$, and suppose that each U_i is wellfounded. Then it is easy to see that $U_0 \triangleleft U_1$, and so U_0 is fully sound. We can arrange this situation with N being non-2-sound (and so $\rho^N_2 < \lambda$, but we might have either $\kappa < \rho^N_2$ or $\rho^N_2 \leq \kappa$).

We now analyze extenders used in iteration trees. The analysis decomposes such extenders into linear compositions of Dodd sound extenders, identified via Dodd-fragment ordinals. The associativity of extenders underlies the analysis.

Definition 2.21. Let P be a k-sound segmented-premouse, $F = F^P$, and E a short extender over P with $\mathrm{cr}(E) < \rho^P_k$. Then $E \circ_k P$ denotes $\mathrm{Ult}_k(P, E)$; $E \circ_k F$ or $\mathrm{Ult}_k(F, E)$ denotes $F^{\mathrm{Ult}_k(P,E)}$. In the absence of parentheses, we take association of $\circ_k$ to the right: $E \circ_k F \circ_l Q = E \circ_k (F \circ_l Q)$. $\dashv$

Lemma 2.22 (Associativity of Extenders)**.** *Let P, Q be segmented-premice, with $F = F^P \neq \emptyset$ semi-close to Q. Let E be a short extender, semi-close to P. Suppose Q is k-sound, $\mathrm{cr}(F) < \rho^Q_k$ and $\mathrm{cr}(F) < \mathrm{cr}(E)$. Then*

$$(E \circ_0 F) \circ_k Q = E \circ_k (F \circ_k Q).$$

Moreover, $i^Q_{E\circ_0 F} = i^U_E \circ i^Q_F$*, where all embeddings are degree* k*.*

Proof. Write $\circ$ for $\circ_0$. Let $i^P_E : P \to \mathrm{Ult}_0(P,E)$ be degree 0. Let $U = \mathrm{Ult}_k(Q,F)$. Then $\mathrm{cr}(E) < \rho^U_k$, $\mathrm{lh}(F) = \mathrm{OR}^P$ is a cardinal in U, and $U|\mathrm{OR}^P = P||\mathrm{OR}^P$. So $\mathrm{Ult}_0(P,E)$ agrees below its height with $\mathrm{Ult}_k(U,E)$, and $i^P_E = i^U_E \restriction \mathrm{OR}^P$. By 2.10, $\nu_{E\circ F} = \nu_E \cup \sup i^P_E{}``\nu_F$. Moreover, for $A \in P \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{cr}(F)^{<\omega})$,

$$i_{E\circ F}(A) \cap \nu^{<\omega}_{E\circ F} = i_E(i_F(A) \cap \mathrm{lgcd}(P)^{<\omega}) \cap \nu^{<\omega}_{E\circ F}. \tag{3}$$

Define an isomorphism $\psi : \mathrm{Ult}_k(Q, E\circ F) \to \mathrm{Ult}_k(U,E)$ by

$$\psi([\tau_q, i_E(a) \cup b]^Q_{E\circ F}) = [\tau'_{(i^Q_F(q),a)}, b]^{\mathrm{Ult}_k(Q,F)}_E,$$

for k-terms τ_q defined from parameter $q \in Q$, and $a \in \nu^{<\omega}_F$, $b \in \nu^{<\omega}_E$, and where τ' is defined from τ by converting some arguments to parameters. Los' Theorem, (3) and the fact that degree k embeddings respect the T_k predicate, show ψ is well-defined and $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_k$-elementary; surjectivity is clear. Moreover, ψ commutes with the ultrapower embeddings, so $i^Q_{E\circ F} = i^U_E \circ i^Q_F$. □

Corollary 2.23. *Let* $P_n, \ldots, P_0, Q$ *be segmented-premice. Suppose that for each* i*,* $E_i = F^{P_i} \neq \emptyset$*,* $\mathrm{cr}(E_{i+1}) > \mathrm{cr}(E_i)$*,* E_{i+1} *is semi-close to* P_i*,* E_0 *is semi-close to* Q*, and* $\mathrm{cr}(E_0) < \rho^Q_k$*. Then, with* $\circ = \circ_0$*,*

$$\begin{aligned} ((\ldots(E_n \circ E_{n-1}) \circ \ldots) \circ E_0) \circ_k Q &= E_n \circ_k (\ldots \circ_k (E_0 \circ_k Q)); \\ i^Q_{((\ldots(E_n\circ E_{n-1})\circ\ldots)\circ E_0)} &= i_{E_n} \circ \ldots \circ i^Q_{E_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.24 (Dodd core)**.** Let G be an extender such that (σ_G, s_G) are defined. The *Dodd core* of G is $\mathfrak{C}_D(G) = G \restriction \sigma_G \cup s_G$. ⊣

Remark 2.25. Let S be a premouse such that every extender on $\mathbb{E}^S_+$ is Dodd sound. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a normal tree on S and let $G \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W})$.

Suppose that G is not Dodd sound. By elementarity, $G = F(M^{\mathcal{W}}_\alpha)$, and α is the unique α' such that $G \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_{\alpha'})$. We write $\alpha_G = \alpha$.

Lemmas 2.11–2.15 show that $\deg^{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha_G) = 0$, and that $\mathfrak{C}_D(G) = F(M^{*\mathcal{W}}_{\beta+1})$, where β is the least β' such that $\beta'+1 \leq_{\mathcal{W}} \alpha_G$ and $F(M^{\mathcal{W}}_{\beta'+1})$ is not Dodd sound; this is the least β' such that $\beta'+1 \leq_{\mathcal{W}} \alpha_G$, there's no model drop in $(\beta'+1, \alpha_G]$ and $\mathrm{cr}(i^{*\mathcal{W}}_{\beta'+1,\alpha_G}) \geq \tau_F$, where $F = F(M^{*\mathcal{W}}_{\beta'+1})$.

Also, $\gamma = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{W}}(\beta+1)$ is the unique ordinal γ' such that $\mathfrak{C}_D(G) \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_{\gamma'})$. For $\mathcal{W}$ is normal and $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma) \leq \mathrm{OR}((M^*_{\beta+1})^{\mathcal{W}}) = \mathrm{lh}(\mathfrak{C}_D(G))$.

Now suppose that G is Dodd-sound. We write α_G for the least α such that $G \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_\alpha)$.

Definition 2.26 (Dodd ancestry)**.** Let $\mathcal{W}$, G be as in (the first paragraph of) 2.25. We define the (*Dodd*) *ancestry of* G *in* $\mathcal{W}$, denoted $\mathrm{Da}^{\mathcal{W}}(G)$, and $<^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}}$, recursively on α_G. If G is Dodd-sound let $\mathrm{Da}^{\mathcal{W}}(G) = \emptyset$. Suppose G is not Dodd-sound. Let $\mathfrak{C}_D(G) \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma)$ (by 2.25, γ is unique). Define $\mathrm{Da}^{\mathcal{W}}(G)$ to be the sequence d with domain

$$\{\beta \parallel \beta+1 \in (\gamma, \alpha_G]_W\},$$



Figure 1: *Dodd ancestry of extender J*

such that $d_\beta = \mathrm{Da}^{\mathcal{W}}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\beta)$.

Now recursively define the relation $<^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}}$ by:

$$\beta <^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} \gamma \iff \exists \beta' \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Da}^{\mathcal{W}}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma))[\beta = \beta' \text{ or } \beta <^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} \beta'].$$

We also write $E^{\mathcal{W}}_\beta <^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} E^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma$ to mean $\beta <^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} \gamma$. ⊣

Note that in 2.26, G is Dodd-sound iff $\mathrm{Da}^{\mathcal{W}}(G) = \emptyset$.

Figure 1 presents a typical Dodd ancestry. An extender E is represented by the symbol $\rfloor$, with $\mathrm{cr}(E)$ and $\mathrm{lh}(E)$ corresponding to the lower and upper bounds of the symbol respectively. $E <_{\mathrm{Da}} F$ iff E is pictured to the left of F, within its vertical bounds. So Dodd sound extenders have no extenders to their left. In the figure, $G <_{\mathrm{Da}} H <_{\mathrm{Da}} J$ and $G <_{\mathrm{Da}} J$, but $G, H \not<_{\mathrm{Da}} I$.

Lemma 2.27. *Let $\mathcal{W}$, G be as in 2.25. Then:*

(a) *For all $\beta <^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} \gamma$ we have $\mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma) < \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\beta) < \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\beta) < \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma)$.*

(b) *Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Da}(G))$, with $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$. For all $\gamma_1' \leq^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2' \leq^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} \gamma_2$, we have $\gamma_1' < \gamma_2'$.*

(c) *Let $\gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Da}(G))$ and let $\lambda = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{W}}(\gamma+1)$. Suppose that $E^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma = F(M^{\mathcal{W}}_\gamma)$. Then $\mathcal{W}$ drops in model at some $\beta \in (0,\gamma]_{\mathcal{W}}$ such that $\beta > \lambda$.*

Proof Sketch. We omit the proof. Parts (a),(b) use 2.25 and the normality of $\mathcal{W}$. Part (c) is mostly similar to part of the proof of closeness, [3, 6.1.5]. □

Definition 2.28 (Dodd decomposition)**.** Let $\mathcal{W}$, G be as in 2.25. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathfrak{C}_D(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\beta) \parallel \beta \leq_{\mathrm{Da}} \alpha_G\}$. The *Dodd decomposition of G* is the sequence of extenders enumerating $\mathcal{E}$ in order of increasing critical point. ⊣

Definition 2.29 (Core sequence)**.** Let P', Q' be premice, and $j : P' \to Q'$ be a k-embedding. We define the *degree k core sequence* $\langle Q_\alpha, j_\alpha\rangle_{\alpha\leq\lambda}$ of j. Set $Q_0 = P'$ and $j_0 = j$. Let $j_\alpha : Q_\alpha \to Q'$ be given. If $j_\alpha = \mathrm{id}$ or the Dodd-fragment ordinals for j_α are not defined, set $\lambda = \alpha$. Otherwise let s, σ be the Dodd-fragment ordinals for j_α and $H_\alpha = \mathrm{rg}(j_\alpha)$. Set

$$Q_{\alpha+1} = \mathrm{cHull}^{Q'}_{k+1}(H_\alpha \cup s \cup \sigma)$$

and

$$j_{\alpha+1} : Q_{\alpha+1} \to Q'$$

the uncollapse map. Take direct limits at limits α. Since $H_\alpha \subsetneq H_\beta$ for $\alpha < \beta$, the process terminates. ⊣

Lemma 2.30. *Let S, $\mathcal{W}$, G be as in 2.25. Let $\mathcal{F} = \langle F_\alpha\rangle_{\alpha<\lambda}$ be the Dodd decomposition of G, and $G_\alpha = \mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathrm{id}, \mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha)$.*

Then $G_1 = \mathfrak{C}_D(G)$ and $G_\lambda = G$.

Let $\alpha \in [1, \lambda]$. Then $G_\alpha = F^{N_\alpha}$ for some premouse N_α, and if $\alpha < \lambda$ then F_α is close to N_α and $\rho_1^{N_\alpha} \leq \mathrm{cr}(F_\alpha)$. Moreover, for all α, there is a normal tree $\mathcal{W}_\alpha$ on S and $\zeta \leq \alpha_G$ and $k \in \omega$ such that:

(*i*) $\mathcal{W}_\alpha\restriction\zeta+1 = \mathcal{W}\restriction\zeta+1$,

(*ii*) $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W}_\alpha) = \zeta + k + 1$,

(*iii*) $G_\alpha \in \mathbb{E}_+(\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{W}_\alpha})$,

(*iv*) $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}_\beta) < \mathrm{lh}(G_\alpha)$ *for all* $\beta+1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W}_\alpha)$,

(*v*) *if* $\zeta < \alpha_G$ *then* $\mathrm{cr}(G) < \nu^{\mathcal{W}}_\zeta$, *and*

(*vi*) *if* $k > 0$ *then* $\mathrm{cr}(G) < \nu^{\mathcal{W}_\alpha}_\zeta$.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on α_G for $\alpha_G + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W})$, with a subinduction on $\alpha \in [1, \lambda]$. So assume it holds for $H = E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\alpha_H}$ for each $\alpha_H < \alpha_G$.

If G is Dodd sound then $\lambda = 1$, and we set $\zeta = \alpha_G$ and $k = 0$.

Suppose G is not Dodd sound. So $\lambda > 1$. We use 2.25 in the following.

Suppose $\alpha = 1$. We have $G_1 = \mathfrak{C}_D(G)$. Set ζ with $G_1 \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_\zeta)$, and $k = 0$. For (v), we have $\zeta <_{\mathcal{W}} \alpha_G$ and

$$\mathrm{cr}(G) = \mathrm{cr}(G_1) < \tau_{G_1} \leq \mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{W}}_{\zeta,\alpha_G}) < \nu^{\mathcal{W}}_\zeta.$$

Suppose $\alpha = \beta + 1 > 1$. So $G_{\beta+1} = \mathrm{Ult}_0(G_\beta, F_\beta)$. Let β' be such that $F_\beta = \mathfrak{C}_D(E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\beta'})$. Let $\gamma' \leq^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} \alpha_G$ be such that $\beta' \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathrm{Da}^{\mathcal{W}}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\gamma'}))$. Let $\varepsilon' = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{W}}(\beta'+1)$. Let ζ be such that $F_\beta \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_\zeta)$. Then define $k \in [1, \omega)$ and $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{W}_{\beta+1}$ by setting $E^{\mathcal{X}}_\zeta = F_\beta$, and $E^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+i} = F(M^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+i})$ for $1 \leq i < k$, such that $G_{\beta+1} = F(M^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+k})$. Each $E^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+i}$ is a sub-extender of some $G' \leq^{\mathcal{W}}_{\mathrm{Da}} G$, and applies to the same premouse in $\mathcal{X}$ as does G' in $\mathcal{W}$. So $\mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+i+1}) < \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+i})$.

For instance, $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{X}}(\zeta+1)=\varepsilon'$. For by 2.25 and normality of $\mathcal{W}$,

$$\mathrm{cr}(F_\beta)=\mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\beta'})<\min(\nu^{\mathcal{W}}_\zeta,\nu^{\mathcal{W}}_{\varepsilon'}),$$

and for each $\delta<\zeta$, we have $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\delta)\leq\nu^{\mathcal{W}}_\zeta<\mathrm{lh}(F_\beta)$. In particular, $\zeta\geq\varepsilon'$. But $\mathcal{W}\restriction\zeta+1=\mathcal{X}\restriction\zeta+1$, so $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{X}}(\zeta+1)=\varepsilon'$. If $\gamma'=\alpha_G$ then $k=1$. Otherwise $k>1$, and $E^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+1}=F(M^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+1})$ is a subextender of $E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\beta'+1}$, a subextender of $E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\gamma'}$, and each apply to the same premouse, etc.

We claim that $\mathcal{W}_{\beta+1}=\mathcal{X}$ is as desired. Certainly $\mathcal{X}$ is normal, and its models are wellfounded, since they embed into models of $\mathcal{W}$. Now let $H_0=F_\beta$ and let $H_{i+1}=F(M^{*\mathcal{W}}_{\zeta+i+1})$ for $i<k$. Then using 2.23, $F(M^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+k})$ is

$$(\ldots((H_0\circ_0 H_1)\circ_0 H_2)\circ\ldots\circ_0 H_k)=H_0\circ_0 H_1\circ_0\ldots\circ_0 H_k. \tag{4}$$

Now let α_D be such that $\mathfrak{C}_D(G)$ is on $\mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{W}}_{\alpha_D})$. Let $\xi'=\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{X}}(\xi+k)$. So

$$\xi'=\max([\alpha_D,\alpha_G)_{\mathcal{W}}\cap\beta'+1).$$

Let

$$X=\{\delta'\parallel\delta'+1\in(\alpha_D,\xi']_{\mathcal{W}}\}.$$

Then

$$H_k=\mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathfrak{C}_D(G),\langle E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\delta'}\rangle_{\delta'\in X}). \tag{5}$$

Let $\delta'\in X$. By induction, $E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\delta'}=\mathrm{Ult}_0(F_\delta,\mathcal{F}\restriction(\delta,\varepsilon))$, where $F_\delta=\mathfrak{C}_D(E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\delta'})$ and either

(a) $\delta'+1=\alpha_G$ and $\varepsilon=\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{F})$; or

(b) $\varepsilon'+1=\min((\delta'+1,\alpha_G]_{\mathcal{W}})$ and $F_\varepsilon=\mathfrak{C}_D(E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\varepsilon'})$.

But then letting $\eta'=\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{W}}(\delta'+1)$,

$$\mathrm{Ult}_0(M^{\mathcal{W}}_{\eta'},E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\delta'})=\mathrm{Ult}_0(M^{\mathcal{W}}_{\eta'},\mathcal{F}\restriction[\delta,\varepsilon)),$$

and the ultrapower maps agree. This fact is a straightforward extension of 2.22; we omit the details. Therefore $H_k=\mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathfrak{C}_D(G),\mathcal{F}\restriction[1,\xi))$, where $F_\xi=\mathfrak{C}_D(E^{\mathcal{W}}_{\xi'})$, and the ultrapower map is that corresponding to (5). We get a similar representation for each H_i, partitioning $\mathcal{F}\restriction[1,\beta+1)$ into $k+1$ intervals. Finally, using (4) and the extension of 2.22, then $F(M^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta+k})$ is

$$\mathrm{Ult}_0(\mathfrak{C}_D(G),\mathcal{F}\restriction[1,\beta+1))=G_{\beta+1}.$$

We leave the remaining details and limit case to the reader. □(2.30)

Lemma 2.31. *Adopt the hypotheses and notation of 2.30. Let P be an m-sound segmented-premouse, with G semi-close to P and $\mathrm{cr}(G)<\rho^P_m$. Then for $\alpha\leq\lambda$, we have $\mathrm{Ult}_m(P,G_\alpha)=\mathrm{Ult}_m(P,\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha)$, and $i^P_{G_\alpha}=i^P_{\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha}$, and the degree m core sequence of $i^P_G:P\to\mathrm{Ult}_m(P,G)$ is*

$$\left\langle Q_\alpha=\mathrm{Ult}_m(P,\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha),i^{Q_\alpha}_{\mathcal{F}\restriction[\alpha,\lambda)}\right\rangle_{\alpha\leq\lambda}.$$

In particular, $i^{Q_\alpha}_{\mathcal{F}\restriction[\alpha,\lambda)}$ is not superstrong.

Suppose further that P is $(m+1)$-solid. Then $i^P_{\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha}$ and $i^{Q_\alpha}_{\mathcal{F}\restriction[\alpha,\lambda)}$ are m-embeddings, preserve p_{m+1}, and are cofinal at ρ_{m+1}.

Proof Sketch. For the characterization of the core sequence of i^P_G, note

$$\mathrm{Ult}_m(P,G) = \mathrm{Ult}_m(\mathrm{Ult}_m(P,\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha),\mathcal{F}\restriction[\alpha,\lambda)),$$

and claim that for each $\beta<\alpha$, the factor embedding

$$i_{\mathcal{F}\restriction[\alpha,\lambda)} : \mathrm{Ult}_m(P,\mathcal{F}\restriction\alpha) \to \mathrm{Ult}_m(P,G)$$

maps the maximal fragments of $i_{\mathcal{F}\restriction[\beta,\alpha)}$ to those of $i_{\mathcal{F}\restriction[\beta,\lambda)}$. This follows the argument for 2.12, and that $\sigma_{F_\beta} < \mathrm{cr}(F_{\alpha'})$ when $\beta+1<\alpha'$.

For the second paragraph, use 2.20 and commutativity. □

3. Extender maximality

We now state the most central theorems of the paper, 3.1–3.6. These all have the same basic theme, but differ a little in their details.

The first result was already stated in the introduction:

Theorem 3.1. *Let N be a $(0,\omega_1+1)$-iterable premouse. Let $E\in N$ be such that $(N||\mathrm{lh}(E),E)$ is a premouse and E is total over N.*

Then E is on $\mathbb{E}^N$.

We set up some terminology before stating the remaining theorems.

Definition 3.2. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a k-maximal tree on a k-sound premouse N, of length $\zeta+1$. Let $P=M^{\mathcal{W}}_\zeta$ and $\gamma\leq\mathrm{OR}(P)$, with $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{W}}_\alpha)<\gamma$ for every $\alpha+1<\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W})$. Let E be an extender such that $(P||\gamma,E)$ is a premouse.

The *potential k-maximal tree* $\mathcal{W}^\frown\langle E\rangle$ is the "putative iteration tree" $\mathcal{W}^+$ on N of length $\zeta+2$, with $\mathcal{W}^+\restriction(\zeta+1)=\mathcal{W}$ and $E^{\mathcal{W}^+}_\zeta=E$, and with $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{W}^+}(\zeta+1)$, etc, determined by the rules for k-maximality. We say the tuple $(k,\mathcal{W},\zeta,P,E,\mathcal{W}^+)$ is *potential for N*. ⊣

Theorem 3.3. *Let N be a $(0,\omega_1+1)$-iterable premouse. Suppose there are cofinally many $\gamma<\mathrm{OR}^N$ such that $N|\gamma$ is admissible. Suppose that if N has a largest cardinal κ then $N\models$"$\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ is not measurable".*

Let $(0,\mathcal{W},\zeta,P,E,\mathcal{W}^+)$ be potential for N, with $E\in N$ and $\zeta<\omega$. Suppose that $b^{\mathcal{W}^+}$ does not drop in model.

Then E is on $\mathbb{E}^P_+$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let N be a premouse. Let $\eta\in\mathrm{OR}^N$ be a cardinal of N. Suppose $N\models$"η^{++} exists". Let $R\in N$ be a premouse such that $\lfloor R\rfloor=\lfloor N|(\eta^+)^N\rfloor$.*[10] *Let $A\triangleleft R$ be such that $\rho^A_\omega=\eta$. Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be a cutpoint of A.*

[10] We write $\lfloor M\rfloor$ for the universe of M. We don't assume that $R=N|(\eta^+)^N$.

Let $\Sigma \in N$ and suppose that $N \models$ "Σ is an above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(\omega, \eta^+ + 1)$-strategy for R".[11] *Let $(\omega, \mathcal{W}, \zeta, P, E, \mathcal{W}^+)$ be potential for A, such that:*

(a) *$\mathcal{W}, E \in N$ and $\mathcal{W}$ is via Σ,*

(b) *$\mathcal{W}$ is above η,*

(c) *$\mathcal{W}$ has length $< (\eta^+)^N$,*

(d) *$\mathrm{cr}(E) < \eta < \mathrm{lh}(E)$ (therefore $b^{\mathcal{W}^+}$ does not drop) and $\mathfrak{c} < \mathrm{lh}(E)$.*

Then E is on $\mathbb{E}_+^P$.

In part (d) above, the hypotheses "$\eta < \mathrm{lh}(E)$" and "$\mathfrak{c} < \mathrm{lh}(E)$" are already true if $\mathcal{W}$ is non-trivial. In both 3.4 and 3.5, $\mathcal{W}$ is above $\mathfrak{c}$ because it is via Σ, but we do not assume that $\mathfrak{c} \leq \mathrm{cr}(E)$.

Theorem 3.5. *Let N be a premouse. Let $\eta \in \mathrm{OR}^N$ be a regular cardinal of N. Suppose $N \models$ "η^+ exists". Let $R \in N$ be a premouse such that $\lfloor R \rfloor = \lfloor N|\eta \rfloor$. Let $\mathfrak{c} < \eta$ be a cutpoint of R. Suppose that if τ is an N-cardinal and $\eta = (\tau^+)^N$ and if $\mathrm{cof}^R(\tau) \geq \mathfrak{c}$ then $\mathrm{cof}^R(\tau)$ is not the critical point of any R-total extender in $\mathbb{E}^R$.*

Let $\Sigma \in N$ and suppose that $N \models$ "Σ is an above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(\omega, \eta + 1)$-strategy for R". Let $(\omega, \mathcal{W}, \zeta, P, E, \mathcal{W}^+)$ be potential for R, such that:

(a) *$\mathcal{W}, E \in N$ and $\mathcal{W}$ is via Σ,*

(b) *$\mathcal{W}$ has length $< \eta$,*

(c) *$\mathfrak{c} \leq \iota$ where $\iota = \mathrm{lgcd}(P||\mathrm{lh}(E))$,*

(d) *$b^{\mathcal{W}^+}$ does not drop.*

Then E is on $\mathbb{E}_+^P$.

Theorem 3.6 below is finer than the previous results, but our proof requires a stronger iterability hypothesis. Hypotheses (e)(ii) and (f) of 3.6, which assert that $\mathcal{W}$ and E are suitably definable over N, will be made precise in 3.19.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $k < \omega$. Let N be a $(k+1)$-sound premouse and let $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathrm{OR}$ be a cutpoint of N. Suppose N is above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(\omega, \omega_1, \omega_1 + 1)$-iterable.*

Let $\eta \in \mathrm{OR}$ and let Σ be an above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(k, \eta^+ + 1)$-iteration strategy for N. Let $(k, \mathcal{W}, \zeta, P, E, \mathcal{W}^+)$ be potential for N and let $\upsilon = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{W}^+}(\zeta + 1)$. Suppose that:

(a) *$\mathcal{W}$ is via Σ,*

(b) *$\mathcal{W}$ has length $< \eta^+$,*

[11] Note that $\Sigma \subseteq N|(\eta^{++})^N$, so it makes sense to have $\Sigma \in N$.

(c) $\mathfrak{c} < \mathrm{lh}(E)$,

(d) $[0, v]_{\mathcal{W}}$ *does not drop in model or degree and* $\mathrm{cr}(E) < \rho_{k+1}(M_v^{\mathcal{W}})$,

(e) *if* $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W}) \geq \omega$, *then* (*i*) $\mathcal{W}$ *is via* Σ *and* (*ii*) $\mathcal{W}$ *is* $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{r}\Sigma}_{k+1}^N$ *in the codes,*[12]

(f) E *is* $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{r}\Sigma}_{k+1}^N$ *in the codes.*[12]

Then E *is on* $\mathbb{E}_+^P$.

By 2.20, the assumptions of 3.6 imply $\rho_{k+1}(M_v^{\mathcal{W}}) = \sup i_{0,v}^{\mathcal{W}}$ "ρ_{k+1}^N.

Remark 3.7. The literal generalization of these results to "premice" M with enough extenders of superstrong type on $\mathbb{E}_+^M$ fails. For suppose E is a total type 2 extender on $\mathbb{E}^M$, κ the largest cardinal of $\mathrm{Ult}(M, E)$ below $\mathrm{lh}(E)$, $F \in \mathbb{E}_+(\mathrm{Ult}(M, E))$, $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(F)$, $\mathrm{lh}(E) < \mathrm{lh}(F)$ and F is of superstrong type. Then $\mathrm{Ult}(M|\mathrm{lh}(E), F)$ and $\mathrm{Ult}(M, E)|\mathrm{lh}(F)$ are distinct active premice, with the same reduct. If M is iterable and $M \models \mathsf{ZF}^-$, then the other hypotheses of 3.6 also hold.

This doesn't appear to be a strong failure of 3.6, however, since both extenders are on the extender sequence of normal iterates of M. (Also, in Jensen's λ-indexing, these extenders are not indexed at the same point.)

Let N be a $k+1$-sound mouse with $\omega < \rho_{k+1}^N$. Our proofs of 3.1-3.6 require the formation of $(k+1)$-sound, $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$-elementary, proper hulls of N, containing a given parameter. The following lemma helps with this.

Lemma 3.8. *Let* N, n *be such that* N *is an* $(n+1)$*-sound premouse and either*

(*i*) N *is* $(n, \omega_1, \omega_1 + 1)$*-iterable, or*

(*ii*) N *is* $(n+3)$*-sound and* $(n+3, \omega_1 + 1)$*-iterable.*

Let $\theta \in [\omega, \rho_{n+1}^N)$ *be a cardinal of* N *and* $x \in \mathfrak{C}_0(N)$. *Then there is* $q \in \mathrm{OR}(\mathfrak{C}_0(N))^{<\omega}$ *such that the following holds. Let*

$$H = \mathrm{Hull}_{n+1}^N(\theta \cup \{q\}),$$

$M = \mathrm{tr}(H)$ *and let* $\pi : M \to N$ *be the uncollapse embedding. Then* $x \in H$, *and* $M \triangleleft N$, *and* $\rho_{n+1}^M = \theta$, *and* $q = \pi(p_{n+1}^M)$, *and* $p_{n+1}^N = q \backslash \alpha$ *for some* α.[13]

Proof. For notational simplicity we assume $n = 1$, but the proof is general. Note that the second paragraph of the lemma is an $\mathrm{r}\Pi_{n+4}$ statement about N. (This uses that $\{p_{n+1}^N\}$ is an $\mathrm{r}\Pi_{n+3}$ singleton. The set of parameters p which are $n+1$-solid for N is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{n+2}^N$, because we only need to assert the existence of generalized solidity witnesses. The set of p such that

$$N = \mathrm{Hull}_{n+1}(\rho_{n+1}^N \cup \{p\})$$

[12] Cf. 3.19

[13] Given N, n, x, θ, q as in 3.8, we say that q witnesses 3.8 with respect to (N, n, x, θ).

is $\mathrm{r}\Pi^N_{n+3}$.) So we may assume that N is countable, and if (ii) holds, then by replacing N with $\mathrm{Hull}^N_{n+4}(\emptyset)$, we may assume that $\rho^N_{n+4} = \omega$ and N is $(n+4)$-sound.

Let w_0 be the set of 2-solidity witnesses for p^N_2. Let $p \in (\rho^N_2)^{<\omega}$ be $<_{\mathrm{lex}}$-least such that

$$w_0, x \in \mathrm{Hull}^N_2(\theta \cup \{p, p^N_2\}).$$

If $p = \emptyset$ then $q = \emptyset$ witnesses the lemma (by the comparison argument in the next paragraph), so assume $p \neq \emptyset$. Let $\gamma = \max(p)$. Let

$$H_0 = \mathrm{cHull}^N_2((\gamma+1) \cup \{p^N_2\}).$$

We have $H_0 \in N$ since $\gamma < \rho^H_2$. Let $\pi : H_0 \to N$ be the uncollapse. Let $\gamma_1 = \mathrm{cr}(\pi) = (\gamma^+)^{H_0}$. Let $\delta = \mathrm{card}^N(\gamma) = \mathrm{card}^N(\gamma_1) = \rho^{H_0}_2$. Let $R \trianglelefteq N$ be least such that $\gamma_1 \leq \mathrm{OR}^R$ and R projects to δ.

Claim. $\mathrm{pTh}^N_2((\gamma+1) \cup \{p^N_2\})$ *is* $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{r}\Sigma}^R_2$.

Proof. Suppose that (i) holds. Let $\mathfrak{P}$ be the phalanx $(N, (\delta, H_0, 1, \gamma_1))$. Compare $\mathfrak{P}$ with N, forming 1-maximal trees $\mathcal{T}$ on $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ on N. (So $\deg^{\mathcal{T}}(N) = 1$ and $\deg^{\mathcal{T}}(H_0) = 1$.) The details, including iterability and the analysis of the comparison, mostly follow the proof of solidity in [3, §8] and [18], using weak Dodd-Jensen as in [18].

The comparison gives that $b^{\mathcal{T}}$ is above H_0 and non-dropping (so $\deg^{\mathcal{T}}(b^{\mathcal{T}}) = 1$), and $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{U}}$. If $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}} \triangleleft \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{U}}$ then $H_0 = R \triangleleft N$, which suffices. Otherwise let $Q = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{U}}$. Note that $\mathcal{U}$ is non-trivial. In fact, $b^{\mathcal{U}}$ drops in model, since $\rho^Q_2 \leq \delta < \rho^N_2$, and by 2.20.[14] Moreover, letting $\alpha+1 = \min(b^{\mathcal{U}} \backslash \{0\})$, $b^{\mathcal{U}}$ drops in model at $\alpha+1$, but not in model or degree after $\alpha+1$. So letting $R^* = M^{*\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha+1} \triangleleft N$, we have $\delta = \rho^{R^*}_2 \leq \mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{U}}_{R^*,Q})$, so $R^* = R$; also $\deg^{\mathcal{U}}(b^{\mathcal{U}}) = 1$. So all $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^Q_2(Q)$ subsets of δ are $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^R_2(R)$, which suffices.

Now suppose instead that (ii) holds. Let $\mathfrak{P}$ be the phalanx $(N, (\delta, H_0, 1, \gamma_1))$. Compare $\mathfrak{P}$ with N, again producing $\mathcal{T}$ on $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ on N, with both trees 3-maximal. (So $\deg^{\mathcal{T}}(N) = 3$ and $\deg^{\mathcal{T}}(H_0) = 1$.) Argue as in the previous case, but using the fact that N is $(n+4)$-sound and $\rho^N_{n+4} = \omega$, together with standard fine structural arguments, in place of the weak Dodd-Jensen property. □(Claim)

Now $H_0 = \mathrm{cHull}^N_2(\gamma_1 \cup \{p^N_2\})$, so H_0 is a 2-solidity witness with respect to $p^N_2 \cup \{\gamma_1\}$. Let $q_1 = p^N_2 \cup \{\gamma_1\}$. By the claim, $H_0 \in \mathrm{Hull}^N_2(\delta \cup \{q_1\})$. Let $w_1 = w \cup \{H_0\}$ and let $p' \in \mathrm{OR}^{<\omega}$ be $<_{\mathrm{lex}}$-least with

$$x, w_1 \in \mathrm{Hull}^N_2(\theta \cup \{p', q_1\}).$$

So $p' \subseteq \delta$. If $p' = \emptyset$ we set $q = q_1$. Otherwise, repeat the preceding argument with q_1, w_1, p' in place of $q_0 = p^N_2, w_0, p$, and so on, producing

$$q = p^N_2 \cup \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_k\},$$

[14] In fact, 2.20 applied to $\mathcal{T}$ also shows directly that $\rho^Q_2 = \delta$.

with $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2 > \ldots > \gamma_k$ (and k as large as possible). Now repeat the comparison argument from before. Let $\pi : M \to N$ be the uncollapse. We have $\rho_\omega^M = \rho_{n+1}^M = \theta$ is a cardinal of N, M is sound and $M \in N$. The proof of condensation then shows that $M \triangleleft N$. $\square$(3.8)

We now give the proof of 3.4 under the added assumption that $\mathfrak{c} \leq \eta$. We will then explain the modifications needed to prove 3.1, 3.3, 3.5 and 3.6, and show that 3.4 follows from 3.1 in the case that $\mathfrak{c} > \eta$.

Proof of 3.4 assuming $\mathfrak{c} \leq \eta$. The argument has the same overall structure as the proof of the ISC in [3, §10]. We start by giving a quick outline. First, for motivation, make the following simplifying assumptions: that $R = N|(\eta^+)^N$, that $\mathcal{W}$ is trivial, so E coheres $\mathbb{E}^N$, and that we can compare $\mathrm{Ult}(N, E)$ with N, producing trees $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ such that:

- $\mathcal{N}^\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{N}^\mathcal{V}$,
- $i^\mathcal{U}$ and $i^\mathcal{V}$ exist,
- $i^\mathcal{U} \circ i_E = i^\mathcal{V}$, and
- $\nu_E \leq \mathrm{cr}(i^\mathcal{U})$.

Then standard arguments using the ISC show that E is used in $\mathcal{V}$, and $E \in \mathbb{E}^N$, as required.

Now drop the above simplifying assumptions. We don't even know, for instance, that $\mathrm{Ult}(N, E)$ is wellfounded. So we will instead arrange a situation similar to that in the preceding paragraph, but with R replaced by a certain hull M, which will be $k+1$-sound for some k, with $\rho_{k+1}^M = \omega$. Denoting the resulting collapses of E, $\mathcal{W}$, etc, by $\bar{E}$, $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$, etc, and letting $\bar{\iota} = \mathrm{lgcd}(M||\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}))$, we will show that the phalanx

$$\mathfrak{P} = \Phi(\bar{\mathcal{W}}) \frown (\bar{\iota}, \mathrm{Ult}_k(M, \bar{E}), k, \mathrm{lh}(\bar{E})))$$

is iterable. If $\bar{\iota} = \nu(\bar{E})$ (which is equivalent to E being type 1 or 3), then comparing $\mathfrak{P}$ with M and arguing like in the previous paragraph, it is easy to complete the proof. But if E is type 2, and so $\bar{\iota} < \nu(\bar{E})$, and if $\mathrm{cr}(i^\mathcal{U}) = \bar{\iota}$, we will need the Dodd structure analysis from §2 to complete the argument.

We now commence with the details. Note that $\mathcal{W}, E \in R$. Let $k < \omega$ be large enough to reflect the facts about $\mathcal{W}, E, \mathfrak{c}$ into the model M to be defined momentarily, and let $x = (\mathcal{W}, E, \mathfrak{c})$. Now 3.8 applies to R, since R is iterable in N. Let $q \in \gamma^{<\omega}$ witness 3.8 with respect to $(R, k, x, \theta = \omega)$. Let

$$M = \mathrm{cHull}_{k+1}^R(\{q\}).$$

So M is sound, $\rho_{k+1}^M = \omega$, $p_{k+1}^M = \pi^{-1}(q)$, and the uncollapse map $\pi : M \to R$ is a near k-embedding. Let $\bar{\mathcal{W}} = \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{W})$, etc. Then $(\omega, \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \bar{\zeta}, \bar{P}, \bar{E}, \bar{\mathcal{W}}^+)$ is potential for $\bar{A} = M|\bar{\tau}$.

Let $S = \mathrm{Ult}(R, E)$. (It's okay if S is illfounded.) Let $j : N \to S$ be the ultrapower map. Let $\bar{U} = \mathrm{Ult}_k(M, \bar{E})$ and let $\psi : \bar{U} \to j(R)$ be given by the shift lemma. So ψ is a weak k-embedding, commutes with π and the ultrapower embeddings and

$$\psi \restriction (\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}) + 1) = \pi \restriction (\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}) + 1).$$

Now 3.8 applies to $j(R) = \mathrm{Ult}(R, E)$ by elementarity. Let $\iota = \mathrm{lgcd}(P||\mathrm{lh}(E))$. Let $x' = (j(q), \nu(E))$. Let $q' \in j(R)^{<\omega}$ witness 3.8 with respect to $(j(R), k, x', \iota)$.

Let

$$M' = \mathrm{cHull}_{k+1}^{j(R)}(\theta' \cup q')$$

and let $\pi' : M' \to j(R)$ be the uncollapse. Then $M' \triangleleft j(R)|\mathrm{lh}(E)$ since $\mathrm{lh}(E)$ is a cardinal in $j(R)$, so $M' \triangleleft P||\mathrm{lh}(E)$. Moreover,

$$(\nu(E) + 1) \cup \{j(q)\} \subseteq \mathrm{rg}(\pi'),$$

and since

$$\bar{U} = \mathrm{Hull}_{k+1}^{\bar{U}}(\nu(\bar{E}) \cup i_E(\bar{q})),$$

therefore $\mathrm{rg}(\psi) \subseteq \mathrm{rg}(\pi')$. So we get a near k-embedding

$$\psi' : \bar{U} \to M'$$

defined by $\psi' = (\pi')^{-1} \circ \psi$. Let $\bar{\iota} = \mathrm{lgcd}(\bar{P}||\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}))$. Note that

$$\psi' \restriction \bar{\iota} + 1 = \pi \restriction \bar{\iota} + 1$$

and so $\psi'(\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E})) > \iota$ and $\pi, \psi' \in N$. (But $\psi'(\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E})) < \mathrm{lh}(E) = \pi(\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}))$.)

Define the phalanx

$$\mathfrak{P} = \Phi(\bar{\mathcal{W}}) \mathbin{^\frown} \left\langle \bar{\iota}, \bar{U}, k, \mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}) \right\rangle.$$

Claim. $N \models$ "$\mathfrak{P}$ *is* $\omega_1 + 1$*-iterable.*"

Proof. We lift a normal tree $\mathcal{U}$ on $\mathfrak{P}$ to an above-$\mathfrak{c}$, normal tree $\mathcal{V}$ on $\Phi(\mathcal{W})$. Since $N \models$"R is iterable above $\mathfrak{c}$", the claim follows. We use π to lift the models of $\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{W}})$ to $\Phi(\mathcal{W})$ and ψ' to lift $\bar{U}$ to M'. The details of the copying process are mostly standard; we just make a couple of key points.

First we make some remarks regarding the correspondence between $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}}$ and $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{V}}$, etc. We have $\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}) < \mathrm{lh}(E_0^{\mathcal{U}})$, so $\iota < \mathrm{lh}(E_0^{\mathcal{V}}) \leq \mathrm{OR}(M') < \mathrm{lh}(E)$. Thus, if some α is such that $\mathrm{cr}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}) < \bar{\iota}$, then $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ agree about the existence and nature of drops in model or degree at $\alpha + 1$, and if there is a drop in model then $\pi(M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}}) = M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{V}}$. This is because $\pi(\bar{\iota}) = \psi'(\bar{\iota}) = \iota$. If $\mathrm{cr}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}) = \bar{\iota}$ then $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}} = \bar{U}$ and $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{V}} = M'$ and $\deg^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha + 1) = \deg^{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha + 1) = k$.[15]

[15] If we had used $\bar{\iota} + 1$ in place of $\bar{\iota}$ as an exchange ordinal in defining $\mathfrak{P}$, and $\bar{\iota} = \mathrm{cr}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}})$, then $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}} = \bar{P}$ and $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{V}} = M'$. But we have not constructed any appropriate embedding $\bar{P} \to M^*$ for any $M^* \trianglelefteq M'$, so the copying process would break down.

The second point is that (i) $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$ is a cutpoint of $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}$ for each $\alpha \geq 0$, and (ii) $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are above $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$ and $\mathfrak{c}$ respectively. For consider (i). The extenders of $\mathcal{U}$ all have length $> \mathrm{lh}(\bar{E})$. Suppose $\mathcal{U}$ has a last model Z, and let $F \in \mathbb{E}_+^Z$ with $\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}) < \mathrm{lh}(F)$. Suppose $\mathrm{cr}(F) < \bar{\mathfrak{c}}$. Then $F \restriction \bar{\eta} \in \mathbb{E}^{\bar{P}}$ (since $\bar{\eta}, \mathrm{lh}(\bar{E})$ are cardinals of Z and by the ISC and the coherence of $\bar{E}$). But $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$ is a cutpoint of $\bar{A}$, and so of $\bar{P}$, contradiction. So (i) holds. Part (ii) follows because all copy maps send $\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$ to $\mathfrak{c}$.

We leave the remaining details of the copying process to the reader. □

Now since M is (ω, ω_1+1)-iterable in N, the claim above combined with the following lemma shows that $\bar{E}$ is on $\mathbb{E}_+^{\bar{P}}$, and therefore E is on $\mathbb{E}_+^P$, completing the proof of the theorem. The lemma should be compared with [17, 8.6]; there, the exchange ordinal is ν_E instead of η. In the lemma, we allow $b^{\mathcal{W}^+}$ to be dropping (anywhere), but this extra generality does not make things significantly more difficult. (We just needed $b^{\mathcal{W}^+}$ to be non-dropping in order to prove that $\mathfrak{P}$ is iterable.)

Lemma 3.9. *Let M be an ω-sound premouse projecting to ω. Let $\mathfrak{c} < \mathrm{OR}^M$ and let Σ be an above-$\mathfrak{c}$, (ω, ω_1+1)-strategy for M. Let $(\omega, \mathcal{W}, \zeta, P, E, \mathcal{W}^+)$ be potential for M, with $\mathcal{W}$ via Σ. Let $U = M_{\zeta+1}^{\mathcal{W}^+}$ and $k = \deg^{\mathcal{W}^+}(\zeta+1)$. Let $\iota = \mathrm{lgcd}(P \| \mathrm{lh}(E))$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{c} \leq \iota$ and $\mathfrak{c}$ is a cutpoint of $P|\mathrm{lh}(E)$.*

Then $E \in \mathbb{E}_+^P$ iff the phalanx

$$\mathfrak{P} = \Phi(\mathcal{W}) \mathbin{^\frown} \langle \iota, U, k, \mathrm{lh}(E) \rangle$$

is normally (ω_1+1)-iterable.

Proof. The proof that $\mathfrak{P}$ is iterable assuming $E \in \mathbb{E}_+^P$ we mostly leave to the reader since we won't use this fact. The point is that

$$\Phi(\mathcal{W}^+) = \Phi(\mathcal{W}) \mathbin{^\frown} \langle \nu(E), U, k, \mathrm{lh}(E) \rangle$$

is iterable since M is, and (using the fact that E is on $\mathbb{E}_+^P$) there is a direct correspondence between maximal trees on $\mathfrak{P}$ and maximal trees on $\Phi(\mathcal{W}^+)$.

So assume $\mathfrak{P}$ is iterable. We get a successful ω-maximal comparison $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ of $\mathfrak{P}$ with $\Phi(\mathcal{W})$, using Σ to form $\mathcal{Y}$. (As in the proof of the Claim above, both trees are above $\mathfrak{c}$.) Let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{W}^+ \mathbin{^\frown} \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} \mathbin{^\frown} \mathcal{Y}$. If $E \notin \mathbb{E}_+^P$ we can't apply [3, 6.1.5] to $\mathcal{U}$. But for all $\alpha+1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{U})$, $E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}$ is semi-close to $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}}$. Let $Z = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{U}}$. Standard arguments show $Z \trianglelefteq \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{V}}$. By 2.20, Z is unsound, so $Z = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{V}}$. Let $\alpha+1 \in b^{\mathcal{U}}$ be least such that $(\alpha+1, b^{\mathcal{U}}]_{\mathcal{U}}$ does not drop in model or degree, let $n = \deg^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha+1)$ and

$$h = i^{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha+1, b^{\mathcal{U}}} \circ i^{*\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha+1}.$$

Since $Z = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{V}}$, therefore Z is $n+1$-solid, so by 2.20 we have

$$p^Z_{n+1} = h(p_{n+1}(M^{*\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha+1}))$$

and $\rho^Z_{n+1} = \rho_{n+1}(M^{*\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha+1})$. Let $\beta+1 = \min(b^{\mathcal{V}} \backslash \zeta+1)$ and $\chi' = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{V}}(\beta+1)$. Let $\chi = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{W}^+}(\zeta+1)$. Standard arguments now show that $b^{\mathcal{X}}$ is above U and $b^{\mathcal{X}}$ does not drop in model or degree, so that

$$i^{\mathcal{X}} : U \to Z,$$

and that $\chi' = \chi$ and

$$M^{*\mathcal{Y}}_{\beta+1} = Q = M^{*\mathcal{W}^+}_{\zeta+1}$$

(note $U = \mathrm{Ult}_k(Q, E)$) and

$$\deg^{\mathcal{Y}}(\beta+1) = k = \deg^{\mathcal{W}^+}(\zeta+1)$$

(so $(\beta+1, b^{\mathcal{Y}}]_{\mathcal{Y}}$ does not drop in model or degree). Let

$$j = i^{\mathcal{Y}}_{\beta+1, b^{\mathcal{Y}}} \circ i^{*\mathcal{Y}}_{\beta+1}.$$

Then also $i^{\mathcal{X}} \circ i_E = j$, since these maps do not move the generators that generate Q.

If $\iota < \mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{X}})$, standard arguments now show $E \in \mathbb{E}^P_+$. So assume E is type 2, with largest generator γ, and $\mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{X}}) = \iota \leq \gamma < (\iota^+)^U$.

Claim 1. *$G = E^{\mathcal{Y}}_\beta$ is the only extender used on $b^{\mathcal{Y}}$, and $\nu_G = i^{\mathcal{X}}(\gamma+1)$.*

Proof. G is compatible with the extender derived from $j = i^{\mathcal{X}} \circ i_E$. Let $\sigma \in [U, Z]_{\mathcal{X}}$ be least such that $M^{\mathcal{X}}_\sigma = Z$ or $\mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{X}}_{\sigma,Z}) > i^{\mathcal{X}}_{U,\sigma}(\gamma)$. Let $\iota_1, \gamma_1 = i^{\mathcal{X}}_{U,\sigma}(\iota, \gamma)$. Now $E \restriction \iota \in U$, and $G \restriction \iota_1 = i^{\mathcal{X}}(E \restriction \iota)$, since $\mathrm{cr}(E) < \mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{X}})$ and $i^{\mathcal{X}} \circ i_E = j$. So $G \restriction \iota_1 \in Z$. So $\iota_1 < \nu_G$. Since $p^Z_{k+1} = i^{\mathcal{X}} \circ i_E(p^Q_{k+1})$, standard arguments show Z has the $(k+1)$-hull property at $\gamma_1 + 1$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{Hull}^Z_{k+1}((\gamma_1+1) \cup \{p^Z_{k+1}\}) \cap \mathcal{P}(\gamma_1+1) = Z \cap \mathcal{P}(\gamma_1+1). \tag{6}$$

But $\gamma_1 < ((\iota_1)^+)^Z$ and γ_1 is a generator of G. For if $f : \kappa^{<\omega} \to \kappa$ with $f \in Q$, then $\gamma \notin i_E(f)\text{“}\gamma^{<\omega}$, so $\gamma_1 \notin i^{\mathcal{X}}(i_E(f))\text{“}\gamma_1^{<\omega}$. Therefore $\gamma_1 + 1 = \nu_G$. It follows that $M^{\mathcal{X}}_\sigma = \mathrm{Hull}^Z_{k+1}((\gamma_1+1) \cup \{p^Z_{k+1}\}) = M^{\mathcal{Y}}_{\beta+1}$, but then in fact $M^{\mathcal{X}}_\sigma = Z = M^{\mathcal{Y}}_{\beta+1}$, proving the claim. □(Claim 1)

By Claim 1, E is a subextender of G. We will refine this observation, using the Dodd structure analysis. Now 2.3 applies to M and 2.30, 2.31 apply to $\mathcal{V}, G$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \langle F_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha<\lambda}$ be the Dodd decomposition of G. Let $\langle Z_\alpha, j_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha<\lambda+1}$ be the degree k core sequence of $i^Q_G = j$. For $\alpha \leq \beta$ let $j_{\alpha,\beta} = j^{-1}_\beta \circ j_\alpha$. By 2.31, $Z_\alpha = \mathrm{Ult}_k(Q, \mathcal{F} \restriction \alpha)$, $j_\alpha = i_{\mathcal{F}, [\alpha,\lambda)}$, and j_α and $j_{\alpha,\beta}$ are k-embeddings which preserve p_{k+1}.

Claim 2. *There is $\varepsilon \leq \lambda$ such that $Z_\varepsilon = \mathrm{Ult}_k(Q, E)$ and $G_\varepsilon = E$.*

Proof. We will show inductively define k-embeddings

$$i_\alpha : Z_\alpha \to U$$

such that (see Figure 2 for a partial summary):



Figure 2: *Commuting maps for $\alpha \leq \beta$*

- $j_\alpha = i^{\mathcal{X}} \circ i_\alpha$,
- i_α preserves p_{k+1},
- $i_\beta \circ j_{\alpha,\beta} = i_\alpha$ for $\alpha \leq \beta$,
- if $\alpha > 0$ then $\gamma \in \mathrm{rg}(i_\alpha)$,
- if $Z_\alpha \neq U$ then $\mathrm{cr}(i_\alpha) < \iota$.

Case 1. $\alpha = 0$.

We have $Z_0 = Q$. Use $i_0 = i^Q_E$.

Case 2. $\alpha = 1$.

Observe first that $E \restriction \gamma \in U$. This follows the ISC if $E \restriction \gamma$ is not type Z, so suppose otherwise.[16] Then ι is the largest generator of $E \restriction \gamma$, and

$$E \restriction \iota + 1 \approx G \restriction \iota \cup \{\iota_1\}.$$

But $G \restriction \gamma_1 \in Z$, by [11], so $G \restriction \iota \cup \{\iota_1\} \in Z$. But $\mathcal{P}(\iota) \cap Z = \mathcal{P}(\iota) \cap U$, so $E \restriction \iota + 1 \in U$.

Let $s = s_E$ and $\sigma = \sigma_E$. Since $\nu(E) = \gamma + 1$ and $E \restriction \gamma \in U$, $\gamma = \max(s)$. Also, $\sigma \leq \iota$ since $E \approx E \restriction (\iota \cup \{\gamma\})$. So as above, $G \restriction (\sigma \cup i^{\mathcal{X}}(s)) \notin Z$, but for each X such that $E \restriction X \in U$, we have $G \restriction i^{\mathcal{X}}(X) = i^{\mathcal{X}}(E \restriction X) \in Z$. Therefore $s_G = i^{\mathcal{U}}(s_E)$ and $\sigma_G = \sigma_E$. It follows that

$$Z_1 = \mathrm{cHull}^U_{k+1}(\sigma \cup \{s\} \cup \{p^U_{k+1}\}).$$

Let $i_1 : Z_1 \to U$ be the uncollapse.

Now suppose $\iota \leq \mathrm{cr}(i_1)$. Since $\gamma \in s \subseteq \mathrm{rg}(i_1)$, therefore $\gamma < \mathrm{cr}(i_1)$. Since i_1 preserves p_{k+1}, therefore $U \subseteq \mathrm{rg}(i_1)$, so $Z_1 = U$.

Case 3. $\alpha = \beta + 1 > 1$.

Suppose $Z_\beta \neq U$, and by induction, we have $i_\beta : Z_\beta \to U$ and

$$\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(i_\beta) = \mathrm{cr}(j_\beta) < \iota.$$

[16] We can't quote [11] here since we don't know that $(P||\mathrm{lh}(E), E)$ is iterable.

Since $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(F_\beta)$ where F_β is on the extender sequence of a premouse, and is semi-close to Z_β, and Z_β, U, Z have the same $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, we know that κ is inaccessible in Z_β and U. Since $\gamma \in \mathrm{rg}(i_\beta)$ we have $\kappa' \leq \iota$ where $\kappa' = i_\beta(\kappa)$.

Let $E' = E_{i_\beta} \restriction \kappa'$. We claim that $E' \notin U$. For suppose otherwise. Then $i^{\mathcal{X}}(\kappa') = j_\beta(\kappa)$ and $E_{j_\beta} \restriction j_\beta(\kappa) = i^{\mathcal{X}}(E') \in Z$, contradicting 2.31.

So $s = s_{i_\beta}$ and $\sigma = \sigma_{i_\beta}$ are defined. Moreover, since $\sigma \leq \kappa' \leq \iota$, and since $i^{\mathcal{X}} \circ i_\beta = j_\beta$, we have $i^{\mathcal{X}}(s) = s_{j_\beta}$ and $\sigma = \sigma_{j_\beta}$. Now proceed as in Case 2.

Case 4. α is a limit.

This case follows from the commutativity of the maps before stage α.

This defines all i_α. Now since $Z_\lambda = Z$ and $j_\lambda = \mathrm{id}$, there is $\varepsilon \leq \lambda$ such that $Z_\varepsilon = U$ and $i_\varepsilon = \mathrm{id}$, so $i_{G_\varepsilon} = i_E$, so $G_\varepsilon = E$. □(Claim 2)

Fix ε as in Claim 2. Let $\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon$ be as in 2.30 with respect to ε. Then $E = G_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{E}_+(\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon})$. But $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon$ are both normal trees via Σ, using only extenders F with $\mathrm{lh}(F) < \mathrm{lh}(E)$, and $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{W}}||\mathrm{lh}(E) = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon}||\mathrm{lh}(E)$. Therefore $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon$, and $E \in \mathbb{E}_+^P$, as required. □(3.9)

This completes the proof of 3.4. □(3.4)

The proofs of 3.1-3.6 are all similar, and all use Lemma 3.9. The definition of $\mathfrak{P}$ and the proof of its iterability is similar in each case, but some details vary. We discuss the differences now.

Proof of 3.5. Because η is regular in N and by our assumptions about $\mathrm{cof}^R(\tau)$ (in the case that R has a largest cardinal τ), we have (i) if $\alpha < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W})$ and $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{W}}$ does not drop then $\mathrm{OR}(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{W}}) = \mathrm{OR}^R = \eta$, and (ii) we can find $\eta' < \eta$ such that $\mathcal{W}$ can be considered a tree $\mathcal{W}'$ on $N|\eta'$, and with $\sigma_\alpha : M_\alpha^{\mathcal{W}'} \to M_\alpha^{\mathcal{W}}$ the natural embedding, then σ_α is just the inclusion map. So because $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W}) < \eta$, we get $\mathcal{W}', E \in R$. Given this, everything proceeds as in the proof of 3.4, but with $\mathcal{W}'$ replacing $\mathcal{W}$. (We still define $M = \mathrm{Hull}_{k+1}^R(\{q\})$ for some appropriate q, and let $\pi : M \to R$ be the uncollapse. Because $\mathcal{W}' \in \mathrm{rg}(\pi)$, we also have $\eta' \in \mathrm{rg}(\pi)$, and we can arrange that its properties reflect to M.) □

Proof of 3.3. We may assume that N is countable and has a largest cardinal κ. Since $E \in N$, $\mathrm{lh}(E) < \mathrm{OR}^N$, so $\mathrm{lh}(E_m^{\mathcal{W}}) < \mathrm{OR}^N$ for all $m+1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W})$. So we may assume N is passive. Because $N \models$"$\mathrm{cof}(\kappa)$ is not measurable" and the N-cofinal set of admissibles, each model $M_m^{\mathcal{W}}$ has height $\leq \mathrm{OR}^N$. Moreover, the models $M_m^{\mathcal{W}}$ are $\Delta_1^N(l)$ transitive classes of N, where $l = \{\mathrm{lh}(E_0^{\mathcal{W}}), \ldots, \mathrm{lh}(E_{\zeta-1}^{\mathcal{W}})\}$.

Now let $\lambda < \gamma < \mathrm{OR}^N$ be such that:

1. $\lambda > \kappa$ and $E \in N|\lambda$,
2. $N|\lambda$ projects to κ,
3. $N|\gamma$ is admissible.

Then we have:

1. If $[0,m]_{\mathcal{W}}$ drops then $\mathrm{OR}(M_m^{\mathcal{W}}) < \gamma$ and $M_m^{\mathcal{W}}$ is $\Delta_1^{N|\gamma}(\{l,\lambda\})$.

2. If $[0,m]_{\mathcal{W}}$ does not drop then $i^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,m}(\lambda) < \gamma$ and $M_m^{\mathcal{W}}|i^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,m}(\lambda)$ is $\Delta_1^{N|\gamma}(\{l,\lambda\})$.

So, supposing the conclusion of the theorem fails, the failure is a first-order sentence true of $N|\gamma$ (taking $\mathcal{W}, E$ to be minimal counter-examples). Fix $k < \omega$ such that the failure and all properties established reflect into $M = \mathrm{cHull}^{N|\gamma}_{k+1}(\emptyset)$. Let $\pi : M \to N|\gamma$ be the uncollapse. We may assume that π maps the failure $\bar{\mathcal{W}}, \bar{E}$ over M to the failure in $N|\gamma$.

Now argue as in the proof of 3.4 to obtain a suitable lifting map $\psi' : \bar{U} \to M'$. Here use that $\kappa \leq \rho_{k+1}^{N|\gamma}$ (since κ is a cardinal of N), which gives that $\mathrm{lh}(E) < \rho_{k+1}^{U}$ where $U = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{W}^+}$. So we can define M' like before. Define the phalanx $\mathfrak{P} = \Phi(\bar{\mathcal{W}})^\frown \langle \bar{\iota}, \bar{U}, k, \mathrm{lh}(\bar{E})\rangle$ as before, and work in V to prove that $\mathfrak{P}$ is iterable. This contradicts 3.9. □

Proof of 3.1. Let $\gamma < \mathrm{OR}^N$ be such that E is definable over $N|\gamma$ (so $\mathrm{lh}(E) \leq \gamma$). Otherwise proceed as before, defining

$$\mathfrak{P} = (M, (\bar{\iota}, \mathrm{Ult}_k(M, \bar{E}), k, \mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}))),$$

and using the fact that $\mathrm{cr}(E) < \rho_{k+1}^{N|\gamma}$ like in the proof of 3.3. □

Proof of 3.4 assuming $\mathfrak{c} > \eta$. First note that $\mathcal{W}$ is trivial. For otherwise, letting $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(E_0^{\mathcal{W}})$, we have

$$\mathrm{cr}(E) < \eta < \mathfrak{c} \leq \kappa < (\kappa^+)^P < \mathrm{lh}(E_0^{\mathcal{W}}) < \mathrm{lh}(E).$$

Now κ is a cardinal of P, so by the ISC, $E \restriction \kappa$ is on $\mathbb{E}^P$. But $\kappa < \mathrm{lh}(E \restriction \kappa) < (\kappa^+)^P$, so $E \restriction \kappa$ is on $\mathbb{E}^Q$, contradicting the fact that $\mathfrak{c}$ is a cutpoint of Q.

Now working in N, by 3.1 applied to R and E, we see $E \in \mathbb{E}^N$. □

None of the remainder of §3 is needed in §§4,5.

We next proceed toward the proof of 3.6. But first we need to make its statement precise, in terms of the manner in which $\mathcal{W}$ and E are definable over N. This involves coding iteration trees on N, definably over N, which we discuss now.

Remark 3.10. Squashing of premice complicates our tree coding. If N is type 3, we will only have direct representations for elements of N^{sq}. But a tree $\mathcal{T}$ on N can have $\nu(F^N) < \mathrm{lh}(E_0^{\mathcal{T}}) < \mathrm{OR}(N)$, so $E = E_0^{\mathcal{T}} \notin N^{\mathrm{sq}}$. One option is to represent such an E with a pair (a, f) such that $i_{F^N}(f)(a) = E$. But instead, we will adjust the rules of normal iteration trees, to rule out such $\mathcal{T}$.

Definition 3.11. Given an iteration tree $\mathcal{T}$ and $\alpha + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, α is $\mathcal{T}$-*exceptional* iff $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}$ is type 3 and $\nu(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}) < \mathrm{lh}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}) < \mathrm{OR}(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$. A tree $\mathcal{T}'$ on a k-sound premouse N is *pre-adjusted k-maximal* iff there is a k-maximal tree $\mathcal{T}$ on N such that $\mathcal{T}'$ has index set

$$\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T}) \cup \{(\alpha, 0) \parallel \alpha + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T}) \ \&\ \alpha \text{ is } \mathcal{T}\text{-exceptional}\},$$

ordered with $\alpha < (\alpha,0) < \beta$ for $\alpha < \beta$, and if α is $\mathcal{T}$-exceptional, then $E^{\mathcal{T}'}_\alpha = F(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$ and $E^{\mathcal{T}'}_{(\alpha,0)} = E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$, and otherwise $E^{\mathcal{T}'}_\alpha = E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$, and $<_{\mathcal{T}'}$, $D^{\mathcal{T}'}$, $\deg^{\mathcal{T}'}$ are determined as for k-maximal trees.

Given $N, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'$ as above, $\mathrm{adj}(\mathcal{T})$ denotes the unique tree $\mathcal{U}$ on N with $\mathcal{U} \cong \mathcal{T}'$ and the index set of $\mathcal{U}$ an ordinal. Such trees $\mathcal{U}$ are *adjusted k-maximal*.

Given $\mathcal{W}, P, \gamma, E, \mathcal{W}^+$ as in 3.2, we define the corresponding *adjusted potential k-maximal tree* $\mathcal{U} = \mathrm{adj}(\mathcal{W}^+)$ similarly. In particular, if P is type 3 and $\nu(F^P) < \gamma < \mathrm{OR}(P)$, then for some α, $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{U}) = \alpha + 3$, $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha = F^P$ and $E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\alpha+1} = E$. ⊣

Remark 3.12. We make some remarks on the preceding definition; see [13] for more details. We use notation as in 3.11. For $\mathcal{T}'$-indices $x < y$ with $E^{\mathcal{T}'}_y$ defined, we have $\nu^{\mathcal{T}'}_x \leq \nu^{\mathcal{T}'}_y$, and if $\nu^{\mathcal{T}'}_x = \nu^{\mathcal{T}'}_y$ then $x = \alpha$ and $y = (\alpha, 0)$ for some $\mathcal{T}$-exceptional α. The tree structure of $\mathcal{T}' \restriction \mathrm{OR}$ is essentially that of $\mathcal{T}$; but for example if $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(\beta+1) = \alpha$ and α is $\mathcal{T}$-exceptional and $\nu(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) \leq \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta)$ then $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}'}(\beta+1) = (\alpha, 0)$. (Thus, we also might have $\gamma < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ such that $\gamma >_{\mathcal{T}} \beta+1 >_{\mathcal{T}} \alpha$ but $\gamma \not>_{\mathcal{T}'} \alpha$.) In this case, $\mathcal{T}$ drops in model at $\beta+1$ (but with $M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{\beta+1} \notin (M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)^{\mathrm{sq}}$), and $M^{*\mathcal{T}'}_{\beta+1} = M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{\beta+1}$. So for each $\alpha < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, $M^{\mathcal{T}'}_\alpha = M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$, and if $\alpha <_{\mathcal{T}} \beta$ and $(\alpha, \beta]_{\mathcal{T}}$ does not drop in model then $\alpha <_{\mathcal{T}'} \beta$ and $(\alpha, \beta]_{\mathcal{T}'}$ does not drop in model and $i^{\mathcal{T}'}_{\alpha,\beta} = i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,\beta}$. Moreover, for $\mathcal{T}$-exceptional α, whenever $\mathcal{T}'$ forms an ultrapower of some $P \trianglelefteq M^{\mathcal{T}'}_{(\alpha,0)}$, we have $P \triangleleft M^{\mathcal{T}'}_{(\alpha,0)} | \mathrm{OR}(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$.

The map $\mathcal{T} \mapsto \mathrm{adj}(\mathcal{T})$ is well-defined and 1-1, and, for example, $(k, \omega_1, \omega_1+1)$-iterability is equivalent to the corresponding iterability for adjusted k-maximal trees. But by coding only adjusted k-maximal trees, we avoid the problem of 3.10.

Given an iteration tree $\mathcal{T}$ on a premouse N, and $\alpha + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, let $\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$ if $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is type 3 and $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = F(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$, and let $\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$ otherwise. So $\nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) \leq \lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$. If $\mathcal{T}$ is adjusted k-maximal, and $\alpha < \beta < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, then $\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is a cardinal of $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta$, $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha || \lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = M^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta | \lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta$, and if $\beta + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ then $\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha \leq \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta)$.

Definition 3.13 (Minimal Skolem terms)**.** Let φ be an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ formula of $n+1$ free variables. The *minimal Skolem term associated to* φ is denoted $\mathrm{m}\tau_\varphi$, and has n variables. Let R be a k-sound premouse. We define the partial function

$$\mathrm{m}\tau^R_\varphi : \mathfrak{C}_0(R)^n \to \mathfrak{C}_0(R).$$

If $k = 0$ then $\mathrm{m}\tau^R_\varphi$ is just the usual $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_1$ Skolem function associated to φ.

Suppose $k \geq 1$. Let $\vec{x} \in \mathfrak{C}_0(R)^n$. If $\mathfrak{C}_0(R) \models \neg\exists y \varphi(\vec{x}, y)$, then $\mathrm{m}\tau^R_\varphi(\vec{x})$ is undefined. Suppose $\mathfrak{C}_0(R) \models \exists y \varphi(\vec{x}, y)$. Let τ_φ be the basic Skolem term associated to φ (see [3, 2.3.3]). For $\beta < \rho^R_k$, let $(\tau_\varphi)^\beta$ be defined over R as in the proof of [3, 2.10], with q there being (p^R_k, u^R_{k-1}). Let β_0 be the least β such that $(\tau_\varphi)^\beta(\vec{x})$ is defined. Then we define $\mathrm{m}\tau^R_\varphi(\vec{x}) = (\tau_\varphi)^{\beta_0}(\vec{x})$. ⊣

Lemma 3.14. *Let $\Gamma = \mathrm{r}\Sigma^R_{k+1}(\{p^R_k, u^R_{k-1}\})$. The graph of $\mathrm{m}\tau^R_\varphi$ is Γ, and Γ is closed under substitution of minimal Skolem terms, uniformly in k-sound*

premice R of the same type. Let R be a k-sound premouse. Let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_0(R)$. Then

$$\mathrm{Hull}^R_{k+1}(X) = \{\mathrm{m}\tau^R_\varphi(\vec{x}) \parallel \varphi \textit{ is } \mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1} \ \&\ \vec{x} \in X^{<\omega}\}.$$

Proof. We omit the proof; see the proof of [3, 2.10]. □

Remark 3.15 (Coding of finite trees)**.** Let N be a k-sound premouse and $\mathcal{T}$ be a finite, adjusted k-maximal tree on N. In the codes, the models and embeddings of $\mathcal{T}$ are $\mathrm{r}\underset{\sim}{\Delta}^N_{k+1}$, and the $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{\deg^\mathcal{T}(n)+1}$ satisfaction relation for $M^\mathcal{T}_n$ is $\mathrm{r}\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}^N_{k+1}$.[17] That is, there are $\mathrm{r}\underset{\sim}{\Delta}^N_{k+1}$ relations

$$\mathsf{M}_n(x),\ \approx_n(x,y),\ e_n(x,y),\ \mathbb{E}_n(x),\ F_n(x),\ i_{n,m}(x,y)$$

(e.g. $\mathsf{M}_n(x)$ is in two variables n, x) such that properties (1)-(8) below hold:

(1) $\approx_n$ is an equivalence relation on M_n.

(2) $e_n \subseteq \mathsf{M}_n \times \mathsf{M}_n$ and $\mathbb{E}_n, F_n \subseteq \mathsf{M}_n$, and $e_n, \mathbb{E}_n, F_n$ each respect $\approx_n$.

(3) $M^\mathcal{T}_n = (|M^\mathcal{T}_n|, \in, \mathbb{E}(M^\mathcal{T}_n), F(M^\mathcal{T}_n)) \cong (\mathsf{M}_n, e_n, \mathbb{E}_n, F_n)/{\approx_n}$.

(4) $i_{n,m} \neq \emptyset$ just when $i^\mathcal{T}_{n,m}$ is defined, and in this case, $i_{n,m} \subseteq \mathsf{M}_n \times \mathsf{M}_m$ and respects $(\approx_n, \approx_m)$, and $i^\mathcal{T}_{n,m} \cong i_{n,m}/(\approx_n, \approx_m)$.

Before continuing with the properties, we make some definitions.

Let $\varsigma_n : \mathsf{M}_n \to M^\mathcal{T}_n$ be the natural surjection. If $\varsigma_n(x) = x'$, we say (x, n) is a *code* for (x', n) (or just x is a code for x' if n is understood).

Let $d^\mathcal{T}$ be the relation defined by

$$d^\mathcal{T}(m,n) \iff m <_\mathcal{T} n \text{ and } (m,n]_\mathcal{T} \text{ drops in model or degree.}$$

Let $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}^\mathcal{T} = (<_\mathcal{T}, D^\mathcal{T}, \deg^\mathcal{T}, d^\mathcal{T})$ and let $\mathrm{lh}(\mathfrak{t})$ denote $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$.

Let $\rho^{-N}_{k-1} = \rho^N_{k-1}$ if $\rho^N_{k-1} < \mathrm{OR}(\mathfrak{C}_0(N))$, and $\rho^{-N}_{k-1} = \emptyset$ otherwise.

We say p is *good for* $\mathcal{T}$[18] iff

$$p = (p^N_k, u^N_{k-1}, \rho^{-N}_{k-1}, \mathfrak{t}, \vec{x}),$$

for some $\vec{x} \in N^{\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})-1}$ such that for each $n+1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, we have:

- $\mathsf{M}_n(x_n)$,
- if $E^\mathcal{T}_n = F(M^\mathcal{T}_n)$ then $\varsigma_n(x_n) = \emptyset$, and
- if $E^\mathcal{T}_n \neq F(M^\mathcal{T}_n)$ then $\varsigma_n(x_n) = \mathrm{lh}(E^\mathcal{T}_n)$.

[17] The $\mathrm{r}\Delta^N_{k+1}$, $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{\deg^\mathcal{T}(n)+1}$ and $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^N_{k+1}$ referenced here are all pure, not generalized. Likewise elsewhere in this paper, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

[18] We have encoded in good p more information than strictly necessary, so as to skip some calculations.

We now continue with the properties:

(5) The definitions of M_n, etc, are $\mathrm{r}\Delta^N_{k+1}(\{p\})$ in any parameter p good for $\mathcal{T}$; these definitions only depend on k and the type of N (they are otherwise uniform in $\mathcal{T}, N$).

(6) *Satisfaction*: The relation $\mathsf{Sat}_n(\varphi, x)$, which is the set of triples (n, φ, x) such that

  (a) φ is an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{\mathrm{deg}^{\mathcal{T}}(n)+1}$ formula,
  (b) $\mathsf{M}_n(x)$, and
  (c) $M_n^{\mathcal{T}} \models \varphi(\varsigma_n(x))$,

  is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^N_{k+1}(\{p\})$ for good p, uniformly. Moreover, the set of triples (n, φ, x) such that

  (a) $\mathcal{T}$ drops in model or degree in $(0, n]_{\mathcal{T}}$ and
  (b) $\mathsf{Sat}_n(\varphi, x)$,

  is $\mathrm{r}\Delta^N_{k+1}(\{p\})$ for good p, uniformly.

(7) *Parameters*: There are functions Crit, Star, uniformly $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}(\{p\})$ for good p, such that:

  (a) $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{Crit}) = \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T}) - 1$. We have $\mathsf{M}_n(\mathsf{Crit}_n)$ and $\varsigma_n(\mathsf{Crit}_n) = \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_n)$.
  (b) $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{Star}) = \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})\backslash\{0\}$. If $n+1 \notin D^{\mathcal{T}}$ then $\mathsf{Star}_{n+1} = \emptyset$; otherwise

$$\mathsf{M}_{\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(n+1)}(\mathsf{Star}_{n+1})$$

  and

$$\varsigma_{\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(n+1)}(\mathsf{Star}_{n+1}) = \mathrm{OR}(M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{n+1}).$$

(8) *Translations*: There are functions Shift, Def, $\mathsf{MeasDef}$, uniformly $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}(\{p\})$ for good p, such that:

  (a) *Shifting generators*: $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{Shift})$ is the set of tuples (m, n, x) such that
    (i) $m, n < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ and $m \neq n$ and $\mathsf{M}_m(x)$, and
    (ii) letting $i = \min(m, n)$, we have $\varsigma_m(x) \in \lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_i$.
    If $\mathsf{Shift}_{m,n}(x) = y$ then $\mathsf{M}_n(y)$ and $\varsigma_n(y) = \varsigma_m(x)$.
  (b) *Definitions of sets; cf.* [3, 4.5]: $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{Def})$ is the set of tuples

$$(n+1, x, \varphi)$$

    such that $n+1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mathsf{M}_{n+1}(x)$ and φ is an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{\mathrm{deg}^{\mathcal{T}}(n+1)+1}$ formula.
    If $z = \mathsf{Def}_{n+1}(x, \varphi)$ and $m = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(n+1)$ then $z = (x', \varphi')$, where:
    (i) $\mathsf{M}_m(x')$ with $\varsigma_m(x') \in M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{n+1}$,

(ii) φ' is an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{\mathrm{deg}^{\mathcal{T}}(n+1)+1}$ formula, and

(iii) for all $\alpha < \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_n)$, we have

$$M^{\mathcal{T}}_{n+1} \models \varphi(\varsigma_{n+1}(x), \alpha) \iff M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{n+1} \models \varphi'(\varsigma_m(x'), \alpha).$$

(c) *Definitions of measures; cf.* [3, 6.1.5]: $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{MeasDef})$ is the set of pairs (n, a) such that $n+1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mathsf{M}_n(a)$ and $\varsigma_n(a) \in (\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_n)^{<\omega}$. If $z = \mathsf{MeasDef}_n(a)$ and $m = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(n+1)$ then $z = (x, \varphi)$ where:

(i) $\mathsf{M}_m(x)$ and $\varsigma_m(x) \in \mathfrak{C}_0(M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{n+1})$ and φ is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_1$, and

(ii) for all sets A measured by $E^{\mathcal{T}}_n$, we have

$$A \in (E^{\mathcal{T}}_n)_{\varsigma_n(a)} \iff M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{n+1} \models \varphi(A, \varsigma_m(x)).$$

This completes the list of properties.

The definitions above are made recursively and properties proved inductively. For instance, we can take $\mathsf{M}_{m+1}(c)$ to be defined: $c = ((q,t),b)$, where:

- $\mathsf{M}_{\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(m+1)}(q)$,
- $\varsigma_{\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(m+1)}(q) \in M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{m+1}$,
- t is a generalized $\mathrm{deg}^{\mathcal{T}}(m+1)$ term,
- $\mathsf{M}_m(b)$ and
- $\varsigma_m(b) \in (\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_m)^{<\omega}$.

The main arguments follow the proofs of [3, 4.5] and [3, 6.1.5], observing that everything is sufficiently effective. We just discuss the main details in defining $\mathsf{MeasDef}_n(a)$.

Let $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{MeasDef}_n)$ and suppose $(E^{\mathcal{T}}_n)_{\varsigma_n(a)} \in M^{\mathcal{T}}_n$. Let

$$m = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(n+1);$$

suppose $m < n$. Let

$$j+1 = \min((0,n]_{\mathcal{T}} \setminus (m+1))$$

and $i = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(j+1)$. So

$$i \leq m < j+1 \leq_{\mathcal{T}} n.$$

Suppose $E^{\mathcal{T}}_n \neq F(M^{\mathcal{T}}_n)$. Using the $\mathrm{r}\Delta_1$ satisfaction relation for $M^{\mathcal{T}}_n$, one can effectively (in good p) convert codes a such that $\varsigma_n(a) \in (\lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_n)^{<\omega}$ to tuples $(\gamma_a, r_a, \varphi_a)$ such that:

- $\mathsf{M}_n(\gamma_a)$ and $\mathsf{M}_n(r_a)$ and φ_a is a formula, and
- letting $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_n)$, $\gamma = \varsigma_n(\gamma_a)$ and $r = \varsigma_n(r_a)$, we have

(i) $\gamma \in (\kappa^{++})^{M^{\mathcal{T}}_n}$ and $r \in \gamma^{<\omega}$ and

(ii) $(E^{\mathcal{T}}_n)_{\varsigma_n(a)}$ is defined by φ_a from r over $M^{\mathcal{T}}_n|\gamma$.

Using Shift, γ_a, r_a can then be translated to M_{m+1}-codes γ'_a, r'_a for γ, r, since if $m+1<n$ then $(\kappa^{++})^{M^{\mathcal{T}}_n} \leq \lambda^{\mathcal{T}}_{m+1}$. Let $\gamma'_a = ((q,t),b)$. Let $\mu = \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_m)$ and

$$l = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(m+1).$$

Because $\gamma < (\kappa^{++})^{M^{\mathcal{T}}_{m+1}}$ there is a function

$$f \in M^{\mathcal{T}}_m|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_m) \cap M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{m+1}$$

with

$$f : \mu^{|t|} \to M^{\mathcal{T}}_m|\mu$$

such that

$$i^{\mathcal{T}}_{l,m+1}(f)(\varsigma_m(b)) = \gamma = t^{M^{\mathcal{T}}_{m+1}}(i^{\mathcal{T}}_{l,m+1}(\varsigma_l(q)), \varsigma_m(b)).$$

Such a function f can be chosen using a minimal Skolem term applied to c, since using $\mathsf{MeasDef}$ we can pass from b to a definition of $(E^{\mathcal{T}}_m)_{\varsigma_m(b)}$ over $M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{m+1}$. Then, Shift translates f to $f_\gamma \in \mathsf{M}_m$. So we have identified codes $f_\gamma, b_\gamma \in \mathsf{M}_m$ such that

$$i_{E^{\mathcal{T}}_m}(\varsigma_m(f_\gamma))(\varsigma_m(b_\gamma)) = \gamma.$$

We can do likewise for r, obtaining $f_r, b_r \in \mathsf{M}_m$. We then get an

$$\mathrm{r}\Sigma_1^{M^{\mathcal{T}}_m|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_m)}(\{\varsigma_m(f_\gamma, b_\gamma, f_r, b_r)\})$$

definition of $(E^{\mathcal{T}}_n)_{\varsigma_n(a)}$, and

$$M^{\mathcal{T}}_m|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_m) \trianglelefteq M^{*\mathcal{T}}_{n+1},$$

so this suffices.

If, instead, $E^{\mathcal{T}}_n = F(M^{\mathcal{T}}_n)$, use the proof of [3, 6.1.5] combined with use of Def and the preceding argument. We leave the remaining details to the reader.

We now extend the coding to infinite trees $\mathcal{T}$. For this we need that the full tree structure, and a function specifying the extenders used in the tree, are given in advance, in a manner suitably definable from some parameter.

Definition 3.16. Let N be a k-sound premouse. Let $\lambda \in [1, \mathrm{OR}(\mathfrak{C}_0(N))]$ and let $\mathfrak{t} = (<_{\mathfrak{t}}, D^{\mathfrak{t}}, \deg^{\mathfrak{t}}, d^{\mathfrak{t}})$ consist of a tree order, drop and degree structure on λ, with $d^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as in 3.15.

Suppose $\lambda < \omega$. For $\vec{x} \in N^{\lambda-1}$ let $p = p(\mathfrak{t}, \vec{x}) = (p^N_k, u^N_{k-1}, \rho^{-N}_{k-1}, \mathfrak{t}, \vec{x})$. We say p is *coherent* (*for* N) iff there is an adjusted k-maximal tree $\mathcal{T}$ on N such that p is good for $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}^{\mathcal{T}}$.

Now remove the restriction that $\lambda < \omega$, but suppose that $\mathfrak{t}$ is $\mathrm{r}\Delta^N_{k+1}(N)$. Fix an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^N_{k+1}(N)$ function $\mathfrak{h}$. Let $S \subseteq \lambda \times N$ and let I_S be the projection of S on its left coordinate.

We say S is a *support* (*for* $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{h})$) iff:

1. S is finite and $0 \in I_S$.

2. If $(\alpha+1, x) \in S$ then $x = ((\alpha, a), (\beta, q, \tau))$ for some a, β, q, τ such that $(\alpha, a), (\beta, q) \in S$ and $\beta = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathfrak{t}}(\alpha+1)$, and τ is an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{\mathrm{deg}^{\mathfrak{t}}(\alpha+1)}$ Skolem term, $(\alpha, \mathfrak{lh}(\alpha)) \in S$, and $\beta + 1 \in I_S$.

3. If $(\alpha, x) \in S$ and α is a limit then $x = (\beta+1, y, \gamma+1, z)$ for some β, γ such that $\gamma + 1 <_{\mathfrak{t}} \alpha$ and $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathfrak{t}}(\gamma+1) = \beta + 1$ and $\neg d^{\mathfrak{t}}(\beta+1, \alpha)$ and $(\beta+1, y) \in S$ and $(\gamma+1, z) \in S$ and $(\gamma+1, \alpha) \cap I_S = \emptyset$.

Let S be a support and $I_S = p[S]$. Let

$$E_S = \{\alpha \in I_S \parallel \alpha + 1 \in I_S\}.$$

Let $P_S = I_S \backslash (E_S \cup \{\max(I_S)\})$. Let $\mathfrak{t}_S = \mathfrak{t} \restriction I_S$. We consider $\mathfrak{t}_S$ as a padded tree structure, with padding occurring at precisely the ordinals in P_S. Let $\mathrm{tr}(\mathfrak{t}_S)$ be the non-padded tree structure which is otherwise isomorphic to $\mathfrak{t}_S$. For $(\alpha, x) \in S$ define $\mathrm{tr}(\alpha, x)$, recursively, by:

1. $\mathrm{tr}(0, x) = x$;

2. $\mathrm{tr}(\alpha+1, ((\alpha, a), (\beta, q, \tau))) = (\mathrm{tr}(\alpha, a), (\mathrm{tr}(\beta, q), \tau))$;

3. for limit α, $\mathrm{tr}(\alpha, (\beta+1, y, \gamma+1, z)) = \mathrm{tr}(\gamma+1, z)$.

Let $p(\mathfrak{t}, S) = p(\mathrm{tr}(\mathfrak{t}_S), \vec{x})$ where

$$\vec{x} = \langle x_i \rangle_{i < \mathrm{card}(E_S)} \approx \langle \mathrm{tr}(\alpha, \mathfrak{lh}(\alpha)) \rangle_{\alpha \in E_S}.$$

We say $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{lh})$ is *coherent* (*for* N) iff for every support S, $p(\mathfrak{t}, S)$ is coherent.

Suppose $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{lh})$ is coherent. Then we define $\mathrm{r}\Delta^N_{k+1}(N)$ relations $\mathsf{M}^*_\alpha(x)$, etc, and $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^N_{k+1}(N)$ relations $\mathsf{Sat}^*_\alpha(\varphi, x)$, etc (we define analogues of all relations defined in 3.15) as follows. For good p, let M^p, etc, denote the relations M, etc, defined as in 3.15 from p, and let $\mathcal{T}^p$ be the corresponding tree on N. For $x \in N$, we define

$$\mathsf{M}^*_\alpha(x) \iff \exists S \left[S \text{ is a support for } (\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{lh}) \ \&\ (\alpha, x) \in S \ \&\ \mathsf{M}^{p(\mathfrak{t}, S)}_{\mathrm{ot}(\alpha \cap E_S)}(\mathrm{tr}(\alpha, x)) \right].$$

The remaining relations are defined similarly. $\dashv$

Remark 3.17. Let $N, k, \mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{lh}$ be as in 3.16 with $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{lh})$ coherent. Then there is a unique adjusted putative k-maximal tree $\mathcal{T}$ on N, such that $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \lambda$, $\mathfrak{t} \restriction \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathfrak{t}^{\mathcal{T}}$, and either $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T}) = \lambda$ or $\mathcal{T}$ has a last, illfounded model, and for each $\alpha < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$,

$$M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha \cong (\mathsf{M}^*_\alpha, e^*_\alpha, \mathbb{E}^*_\alpha, F^*_\alpha)/\approx^*_\alpha,$$

and letting

$$\varsigma^*_\alpha : \mathsf{M}^*_\alpha \to M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$$

be the natural surjection, if $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = F(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$ then $\varsigma^*_\alpha(\mathfrak{lh}(\alpha)) = \emptyset$, and otherwise $\varsigma^*_\alpha(\mathfrak{lh}(\alpha)) = \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$. Moreover, Sat^*_α defines $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{\mathrm{deg}^{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)+1}$ satisfaction for $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$

(in the codes), etc, as in 3.15. This essentially follows from [15, §2]. In [15], adjusted trees were not used, but it is straightforward to modify the methods there. Now if $I_S = I_{S'}$ then $p(\mathfrak{t}, S) = p(\mathfrak{t}, S')$. So, using [15], it follows that if S is a support and $\alpha \in I_S$ and $n = \mathrm{ot}(\alpha \cap E_S)$ then

$$\pi : M_n^{\mathcal{T}^p} \to M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}$$

is a near $\deg^{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$-embedding, where for all supports S' such that $I_{S'} = I_S$ and all $(\alpha, x) \in S'$, we define

$$\pi(\varsigma_n^p(\mathrm{tr}(\alpha, x))) = \varsigma_\alpha^*((\alpha, x)).$$

Thus, Sat^* correctly computes truth.

In the context of 3.16, the set of all coherent p is a boolean combination of $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}^N(\{q\})$ sets, where $q = (p_k^N, u_{k-1}^N, \rho_{k-1}^{-N})$, uniformly in N (k-sound, of the same type). For example, with such complexity, one can assert that for each n, $\mathsf{M}_n(x_n)$ and x_n codes either $\emptyset$ or the index of an extender on $\mathbb{E}(\mathfrak{C}_0(M_n^{\mathcal{T}}))$, and that drops occur exactly where $\mathfrak{t}$ specifies.

The collection of tuples $(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_3, x)$ such that:

- each φ_i is an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ formula,
- $x \in N$,
- $\varphi_0(x, \cdot)$ and $\varphi_1(x, \cdot)$ define a tree structure $\mathfrak{t}$ and its complement over N,
- $\varphi_2(x, \cdot)$ and $\varphi_3(x, \cdot)$ define a function $\mathfrak{lh}$ and its complement over N, and
- $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{lh})$ is coherent,

is Π_1-over-$\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}^N(\{q\})$, for

$$q = (\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_3, x, p_k^N, u_{k-1}^N, \rho_{k-1}^{-N}),$$

uniformly in N. Therefore this property (when true) is passed downward to $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ elementary substructures.

The following definition completes the description of our coding.

Definition 3.18. Let $N, k, \mathfrak{t}, \mathrm{lh}, \mathcal{T}$ be as in 3.17. Then $(x, \varphi_{\mathrm{lh}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{t}}, \varphi_{\neg\mathfrak{t}}) \in N \times \omega^3$ is *good for* $\mathcal{T}$ iff $\mathrm{lh}, \mathfrak{t}, \neg\mathfrak{t}$ are $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}^N(\{x\})$, via the formulas $\varphi_{\mathrm{lh}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{t}}, \varphi_{\neg\mathfrak{t}}$. ⊣

Remark 3.19. We now clarify hypotheses 3.6(e)(ii),(f). Let $\mathcal{X}^+ = \mathrm{adj}(\mathcal{W}^+)$. Let $\zeta' + 2 = \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{X}^+)$. So $P||\gamma = M_{\zeta'}^{\mathcal{X}^+}||\gamma$ and $E_{\zeta'}^{\mathcal{X}^+} = E$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^+ \restriction (\zeta' + 1)$.

Then 3.6(e)(ii) just asserts that there is some p good for $\mathcal{X}$.

If $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W}) \geq \omega$, so the above applies, let $\mathsf{M}_{\zeta'}^*$ be defined from p via 3.18 and 3.16. If $\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{W}) < \omega$, let p be good for $\mathcal{X}$ and let $\mathsf{M}_{\zeta'}$ be defined from p as in 3.15. Let $E^* \subseteq \mathsf{M}_{\zeta'}^*$ (or $E^* \subseteq \mathsf{M}_{\zeta'}$) be the set of codes for elements of $\tilde{E}$ (the $P||\gamma$-amenable predicate for E). Then 3.6(f) just asserts that E^* is $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{r}\Sigma}_{k+1}^N$.

Proof of 3.6. We follow the notation used in the preceding discussion of coding. Let $\mathcal{X}^+, \mathcal{X}, \zeta', p$ be as in 3.19. Let $e \in N$ be such that E^* is $\Sigma^N_{k+1}(\{e\})$. Let $q_0 = q \in \mathrm{OR}(N)^{<\omega}$ witness 3.8 with respect to

$$(N, k, x = (\mathfrak{c}, p, \zeta', e, p^N_{k+1}, u^N_k), \omega).$$

Let $M = \mathrm{cHull}^N_{k+1}(\{q_0\})$, let $\pi : M \to N$ be the uncollapse, let $\pi(\bar{p}) = p$ and let $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ be defined over M from $\bar{p}$ as $\mathcal{X}$ is defined over N from p; "bars" denote preimages under π in general.

Claim 1. *We have:*

- (a) *The hypotheses of 3.6 and properties established in the preceding paragraph, regarding $N, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{X}, p$, etc, excluding "$\mathrm{cr}(E) < \rho_{k+1}(M^{\mathcal{W}}_v)$", hold regarding $M, \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \bar{\mathcal{X}}, \bar{p}$, etc. Moreover, $\mathrm{cr}(\bar{E}) < \rho_k(M^{\bar{\mathcal{W}}}_{\bar{v}})$.*
- (b) *$\bar{E} \in \mathbb{E}_+(\mathcal{N}^{\bar{\mathcal{X}}})$ iff $E \in \mathbb{E}_+(\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{X}})$.*
- (c) *$\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ is a hull of $\mathcal{X}$ (see [18]), via hull maps $\pi \restriction \mathrm{lh}(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) : \mathrm{lh}(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) \to \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\pi_\alpha : M^{\bar{\mathcal{X}}}_\alpha \to M^{\mathcal{X}}_{\pi(\alpha)}$, where $\pi_\alpha \circ \bar{\varsigma}_\alpha = \varsigma_{\pi(\alpha)} \circ \pi \restriction \bar{\mathsf{M}}_\alpha$.*[19]
- (d) *π_α is a near $\deg^{\bar{\mathcal{X}}}(\alpha)$-embedding.*

Proof sketch. The premousehood of $(\bar{P}||\mathrm{lh}(\bar{\gamma}), \bar{E})$ uses that the premouse axioms are Q-formulas, E^* is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma^N_{k+1}(\{e\})$, $\mathsf{M}^{\mathcal{X}}_{\zeta'}$ is $\mathrm{r}\Delta^N_{k+1}(\{p, \zeta'\})$, and π is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ elementary. The rest of (a) and (b) are similar. Parts (c) and (d) are proved by induction through $\mathrm{lh}(\bar{\mathcal{X}})$; cf. [15, §2.3]. Part (d) uses either [7], or the uniformity of the definition of Sat in 3.15.[20] □

Let $\epsilon = \mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{X}^+}(\zeta' + 1)$. Let $\bar{U} = \mathcal{N}(\overline{\mathcal{X}^+}) = \mathrm{Ult}_k(M^{\bar{\mathcal{X}}}_{\bar{\epsilon}}, \bar{E})$. Let $\iota = \mathrm{lgcd}(P||\mathrm{lh}(E))$. Let $\mathfrak{P}$ be the phalanx $\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) \mathbin{^\frown} \langle \bar{\iota}, \bar{U}, k, \mathrm{lh}(\bar{E}) \rangle$.

By 3.9, the following claim completes the proof.

Claim 2. *$\mathfrak{P}$ is normally $(\omega_1 + 1)$-iterable.*

Proof. We lift trees on $\mathfrak{P}$ to trees on $\Phi(\mathcal{X})$, using the maps π_α from Claim 1(c), and a weak k-embedding

$$\pi_{\bar{U}} : \bar{U} \to P_0,$$

for some $P_0 \triangleleft P$. We get P_0 and $\pi_{\bar{U}}$ as follows. We have

$$\mathrm{cr}(E) < \rho_{k+1}(M^{\mathcal{X}}_\epsilon) = \sup i^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,\epsilon} \text{“} \rho^N_{k+1}.$$

Let $\mu < \rho^N_{k+1}$ be a cardinal of N with $\mathrm{cr}(E) \leq i^{\mathcal{X}}_{0,\epsilon}(\mu)$. Let $q_1 \in \mathrm{OR}(N)^{<\omega}$ witness 3.8 with respect to (N, k, q_0, μ). Let

$$K_\mu = \mathrm{cHull}^N_{k+1}(\mu \cup \{q_1\}).$$

[19] Writing "$\pi(\alpha)$" involves a slight abuse of notation if $\mathrm{lh}(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) > \mathrm{OR}^M$.
[20] The uniformity itself used the argument of [7].

We have $\sigma : M \to K_\mu$ and $\tau : K_\mu \to N$, near k-embeddings, with $\pi = \tau \circ \sigma$. Let $\tau(\hat{q}_1) = q_1$. Now

$$N \models \forall \varphi \left[\varphi \text{ is an } \mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1} \text{ formula} \Rightarrow \forall z \in \mu^{<\omega} \left[\varphi(q_1, z) \Rightarrow K_\mu \models \varphi(\hat{q}_1, z)\right]\right],$$

and this is an $\mathrm{r}\Pi_{k+1}$ assertion $\psi(q_1, \hat{q}_1, \mu, K_\mu)$.[21] Since $b^{\mathcal{X}^+}$ does not drop in model or degree, $j = i^{\mathcal{X}^+}$ exists and is a k-embedding. So letting

$$U = \mathrm{Ult}_k(M_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}, E),$$

then[22]

$$U \models \psi(j(q_1, \hat{q}_1, \mu, K_\mu)). \tag{7}$$

Let $\varrho : \bar{U} \to U$ be given by the shift lemma. So ϱ is a weak k-embedding.[23] Define a weak k-embedding

$$\varrho' : \bar{U} \to j(K_\mu)$$

as follows. Let $y \in \bar{U}$. We have

$$\bar{U} = \mathrm{Hull}_{k+1}^{\bar{U}}(\{\bar{j}(\bar{q}_0)\} \cup \nu(\bar{E})),$$

so by 3.14,

$$y = \mathrm{m}\tau_\varphi^{\bar{U}}(\bar{j}(\bar{q}_0), b)$$

for some $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ formula φ and $b \in \nu(\bar{E})^{<\omega}$. Let

$$\varrho'(y) = \mathrm{m}\tau_\varphi^{j(K_\mu)}(j(\sigma(\bar{q}_0)), \varrho(b)).$$

Sublaim. *ϱ' is well-defined, is a weak k-embedding, and $\varrho' \circ \bar{j} = j \circ \sigma$.*

Proof. The well-definedness and $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_k$ elementarity follows 3.14 and the fact that if Φ is any $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ formula and $B \in \nu(\bar{E})^{<\omega}$ then

$$\left[\bar{U} \models \Phi(\bar{j}(\bar{q}_0), B)\right] \implies \left[j(K_\mu) \models \Phi(j(\sigma(\bar{q}_0)), \varrho(B))\right]. \tag{8}$$

To see line (8), fix an $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ formula φ_0 and $b_0 \in \mu^{<\omega}$ such that $q_0 = \mathrm{m}\tau_{\varphi_0}^N(q_1, b_0)$. By elementarity and since $\tau \circ \sigma = \pi$, we have

$$\sigma(\bar{q}_0) = \mathrm{m}\tau_{\varphi_0}^{K_\mu}(\hat{q}_1, b_0).$$

So

$$j(\sigma(\bar{q}_0)) = \mathrm{m}\tau_{\varphi_0}^{j(K_\mu)}(j(\hat{q}_1), j(b_0)); \tag{9}$$

$$\varrho(\bar{j}(\bar{q}_0)) = j(\pi(\bar{q}_0)) = j(q_0) = \mathrm{m}\tau_{\varphi_0}^{U}(j(q_1), j(b_0)). \tag{10}$$

[21] It's not clear that this would hold if we allowed φ to be *generalized* $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$.

[22] This and the other facts here don't depend on U being wellfounded.

[23] It's not clear yet that ϱ is a near k-embedding, because the proof of [7] depends on strong closeness with respect to $(M_\epsilon^{\bar{\mathcal{X}}}, \bar{E}), (M_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}, E)$, but here, the measures of $E, \bar{E}$ are ostensibly not definable at all over $M_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}, M_\epsilon^{\bar{\mathcal{X}}}$.

Also, $\varrho \circ \bar{j} = j \circ \pi$, and $\bar{j}, j$ are k-embeddings, π a near k-embedding. So ϱ preserves the $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_k$ theory predicate T_k. So by line (10) and the hypothesis of line (8),

$$U \models \Phi(\mathrm{m}\tau^U_{\varphi_0}(j(q_1), j(b_0)), \varrho(B)).$$

By line (7) and since $j(b_0), \varrho(B) \in j(\mu)^{<\omega}$, and by 3.14, therefore

$$j(K_\mu) \models \Phi(\mathrm{m}\tau^{j(K_\mu)}_{\varphi_0}(j(\hat{q}_1), j(b_0)), \varrho(B)).$$

By line (9), this is the conclusion of line (8), as required.

Now $\varrho'(\bar{j}(\bar{q}_0)) = j(\sigma(\bar{q}_0))$, and $\bar{j}, \sigma, j$ are near k-embeddings, so $\varrho' \circ \bar{j} = j \circ \sigma$. So ϱ' is $\mathrm{r}\Sigma_{k+1}$ elementary on $\mathrm{rg}(\bar{j})$, and $\varrho'(p^{\bar{U}}_k) = p^{j(K_\mu)}_k$, etc. $\square$(Subclaim)

By 3.8, $N \models$"For every cardinal $\lambda \in [\omega, \mu)$ there is $H \triangleleft N|\mu$ and a near k-embedding

$$\varsigma : H \to K_\mu$$

with

$$\mathrm{cr}(\varsigma) \geq \lambda = \rho^H_{k+1}$$

and $\hat{q}_1 \in \mathrm{rg}(\varsigma)$". So U models the same about $j(\mu, K_\mu, \hat{q}_1)$. Let

$$\varsigma_1 : P_1 \to j(K_\mu)$$

witness the latter with respect to $\lambda_1 = \mathrm{lh}(E)$. Condensation holds in N and U, so there is $P_0 \triangleleft U|\lambda_1$ and a fully elementary

$$\varsigma_0 : P_0 \to P_1$$

with

$$\mathrm{cr}(\varsigma_0) = \lambda_0 = \rho^{P_0}_\omega$$

and $\varsigma_0(\lambda_0) = \lambda_1$ and $\max(\nu(E), \mathfrak{c}) < \lambda_0$ and $j(\hat{q}_1) \in \mathrm{rg}(\varsigma_1 \circ \varsigma_0)$. Since $(P||\lambda_1, E)$ is a premouse, $P_0 \triangleleft P||\lambda_1$. Now

$$\varsigma = \varsigma_1 \circ \varsigma_0 : P_0 \to j(K_\mu)$$

is a near k-embedding and

$$\mathrm{rg}(\varrho') \subseteq \mathrm{Hull}^{j(K_\mu)}_{k+1}(\{j(\hat{q}_1)\} \cup \nu(E) \cup (\mathfrak{c}+1)) \subseteq \mathrm{rg}(\varsigma).$$

Define

$$\pi_{\bar{U}} = \varsigma^{-1} \circ \varrho'.$$

Then $\pi_{\bar{U}} : \bar{U} \to P_0$ is a weak k-embedding, $\pi_{\bar{U}} \restriction (\bar{\iota}+1) = \pi_{\bar{\zeta}'} \restriction (\bar{\iota}+1)$ and $\pi_{\bar{U}}(\mathrm{lh}(\bar{E})) > \mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathfrak{c}$ is a cutpoint of P. So $\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{\bar{\zeta}'}, \pi_{\bar{U}}$ lift trees from $\mathfrak{P}$ to above-$\mathfrak{c}$ trees on $\Phi(\mathcal{X})$. $\square$(Claim 2)(3.6)

4. Definability of $\mathbb{E}$

Given a mouse M and $x \in M$, we can ask whether $\mathbb{E}^M$ is definable over $\lfloor M \rfloor$ from x. If so,[24]

$$\lfloor M \rfloor \models \text{“}V = \mathrm{HOD}_x\text{”}.$$

Steel showed that for $n \leq \omega$, M_n satisfies a variant of “$L[\mathbb{E}] = K$ (including $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}^K$)”, so $\mathbb{E}^{M_n}$ is $\lfloor M_n \rfloor$-definable (from $x = \emptyset$). (See [9] for $n < \omega$.) We next prove, in 4.3, that $\mathbb{E}^M$ is $\lfloor M \rfloor$-definable for various mice M, including a new proof for M_n. We will need to assume that M is sufficiently self-iterable and models the power set axiom (PS). We then prove in 4.5 that $M_{\mathrm{nt}}|\delta$ is sufficiently self-iterable, where M_{nt} is the least non-tame mouse and δ is the largest Woodin of M_{nt}. Because of the dependence on self-iterability, this approach to proving “$V = \mathrm{HOD}$” (in a mouse) is essentially limited to tame mice (cf. 4.7).

We remark that, using a quite different approach, Woodin has proved the following weaker version of 4.3. Let M be a tame mouse satisfying PS, and having no Woodin cardinals. Suppose $M \models$“Every proper segment of me is fully iterable”. Then $\lfloor M \rfloor \models$“$V = \mathrm{HOD}$”. However, Woodin's proof does not show that $\mathbb{E}^M$ is definable over $\lfloor M \rfloor$. Also, Nam Trang and Martin Zeman have recently found a proof of self-iterability sufficient to apply 4.3, very different from what we do here, and which works in a different context.

Lemma 4.1. *Let N be a premouse. Let $\gamma < \mathrm{OR}^N$ be an N-cardinal. Suppose $N \models$“γ^{++} exists”. Let $R, S \in N$ be premice such that*

$$\lfloor R \rfloor = \lfloor S \rfloor = \left\lfloor N|(\gamma^+)^N \right\rfloor.$$

Let $\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d} < (\gamma^+)^N$ be cutpoints of both R, S respectively. Suppose that

$$R|\max(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}) = S|\max(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d})$$

and $N \models$“R (S) is above-$\mathfrak{c}$ (above-$\mathfrak{d}$), $(\omega, \gamma^+ + 1)$-iterable”.

Then $R = S$.

Proof. We work in N. Suppose $R \neq S$, and let η be least such that

$$R|(\eta^+)^N \neq S|(\eta^+)^N.$$

Let $R' = R|(\eta^+)^N$ and $S' = S|(\eta^+)^N$. Let Σ, Γ be above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(\omega, \eta^+ + 1)$-strategies for R', S' respectively. Consider the (possibly partial) comparison $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})$ of R' with S', formed using Σ, Γ. (If the comparison reaches length $(\eta^+)^N + 1$, then we stop.)

We claim that $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})$ is above η, and is successful. For take $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})$ to be padded in the usual way. We have $\eta < \mathrm{lh}(E)$ and $\max(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}) < \mathrm{lh}(E)$ for all extenders E used in $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})$. Suppose α is such that $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}) \restriction \alpha + 1$ is above η but

[24] One might want to assume that $\lfloor M \rfloor \models$ ZFC, in order to know that HOD_x is defined as usual.

$\mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha) < \eta$. Then by 3.4, we actually have $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$, so $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha) = M^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha)$, contradiction. So $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{U})$ is above η.

Now suppose $\mathcal{T}$ is non-trivial. Then there is $Q \trianglelefteq R$ such that $\rho^Q_\omega = \eta$ and $\mathcal{T}$ can be considered a tree on Q. This is because $\mathcal{T}$ is above η. Moreover, $b^{\mathcal{T}}$ drops. The same things hold for $\mathcal{U}$. Therefore the comparison is successful (and has length $< (\eta^+)^N$), and (still assuming $\mathcal{T}$ is non-trivial), $\mathcal{U}$ is trivial, and $S \trianglelefteq \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}}$. But then $E^{\mathcal{T}}_0 \in \lfloor R\rfloor = \lfloor S\rfloor \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}}$, contradiction. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let N be a premouse and let $\eta < \mathrm{OR}^N$ be an N-cardinal such that $N \models$ "If η^{++} exists". Suppose there is $\mathfrak{c}$ is a cutpoint of $N|(\eta^+)^N$ and $N \models$ "$N|\eta^+$ is above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(\omega,\eta^+ + 1)$-iterable". Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{H}_{\eta^{+3}})^N$ (if $(\eta^{+3})^N = \mathrm{OR}^N$ then set $\mathcal{H} = \lfloor N\rfloor$).*

Then (a) $\{N|(\eta^+)^N\}$ is a $\Sigma_2^{\mathcal{H}}(\{\eta, N|\mathfrak{c}\})$ singleton, uniformly in N, η and $\mathfrak{c}$.

Moreover (b) if $\mathfrak{c} \leq \eta$, then $\{N|(\eta^+)^N\}$ is a $\Sigma_2^{\mathcal{H}}(\{N|\eta\})$ singleton, uniformly in N and η.

Proof. By 4.1, $\mathcal{H} \models$"$N|(\eta^+)^N$ is the unique premouse R such that:

1. $\lfloor R\rfloor = \mathcal{H}_{\eta^+}$,
2. $N|\mathfrak{c} \trianglelefteq R$,
3. $\mathfrak{c}$ is a cutpoint of R,
4. R is above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(\omega,\eta^+ + 1)$-iterable."

This gives part (a).

Now suppose $\mathfrak{c} \leq \eta$. Then also by 4.1, $\mathcal{H} \models$"$N|(\eta^+)^N$ is the unique premouse R such that for some $\mathfrak{c} \leq \eta$, items 1, 3 and 4 above hold, and $N|\eta \trianglelefteq R$." This gives part (b). □

In the following, if $N \not\models \mathsf{ZFC}$ then we take HOD^N to be the collection of all transitive sets coded by a set of ordinals X such that for some $\gamma < \mathrm{OR}^N$, X is definable from ordinal parameters over $\mathcal{H}^N_\gamma$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let N be a premouse satisfying PS. Suppose that for each N-cardinal $\eta < \mathrm{OR}^N$ there is $\mathfrak{c} \leq \eta$ such that $\mathfrak{c}$ is a cutpoint of N and $N \models$ "$N|(\eta^+)^N$ is above-$\mathfrak{c}$, $(\omega,\eta^+ + 1)$-iterable". Then $\mathbb{E}^N$ is definable over $\lfloor N\rfloor$ and $\lfloor N\rfloor \models$ "$V = \mathrm{HOD}$". In fact, $\{N|(\eta^+)^N\}$ is $\Sigma_2^{\mathcal{H}}$ where $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{H}_{\eta^{+3}})^N$, uniformly in η.*

Proof. Using 4.2(b), we can define $N|\eta$, for N-cardinals η, by induction on η, uniformly in η. (Given $N|\eta$, we determine $N|(\eta^+)^N$ by an application of 4.2(b).) Moreover, the induction leading to and producing $N|(\eta^+)^N$ is in fact Σ_2-definable over $(\mathcal{H}_{\eta^{+3}})^N$ (from no parameters). □

As a corollary, we get an alternate proof of Steel's result that for $n \leq \omega$, $\lfloor M_n\rfloor \models$"$V = \mathrm{HOD}$": Theorem 4.3 applies to $N = M_n$, using $\mathfrak{c}$ as the supremum of the Woodin cardinals δ of N such that $\delta \leq \eta$. (See [16] for the proof of self-iterability in the $n < \omega$ case, and [18, §7] for the $n = \omega$ case.)

Let $M_{\rm nt}$ be the least non-tame mouse. We will show that $N = M_{\rm nt}|\Lambda$ is sufficiently self-iterable to apply 4.3 whenever Λ is a limit cardinal of $M_{\rm nt}$. The general method of proof is standard, but some non-standard details are involved. The method also works for many mice simpler than $M_{\rm nt}$.

We first show that if a non-tame mouse exists then there is indeed a least one.

Lemma 4.4. *(a) Let N be a non-tame premouse with no non-tame proper segment. Let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_0(N)$. Then $\mathrm{cHull}_1^N(X)$ is non-tame. Therefore if N is $(0, \omega_1+1)$-iterable then $M_{\rm nt}$ is well-defined,*

$$M_{\rm nt} = \mathrm{cHull}_1^N(\emptyset),$$

$\rho_1(M_{\rm nt}) = \omega$ and $p_1(M_{\rm nt}) = \emptyset$.

(b) Let M be a type 3 premouse with $\nu(M)$ regular in M. Let $\nu(M) = [a,f]^M_{F^M}$ with $a, f \in M$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a 0-maximal tree on M such that $i^{\mathcal{T}}$ exists. Let $R = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}}$. Then

$$\nu(R) = [i^{\mathcal{T}}(a), i^{\mathcal{T}}(f)]^R_{F^R}.$$

Therefore if M is non-tame then so is R.

Proof. (a) N is type 3 and $\nu(F^N) = [\{\kappa\}, f]^N_{F^N}$ where $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(F^N)$ and

$$f : \kappa \to \kappa$$

is such that $f(\alpha)$ is the least Woodin δ of N such that $\delta > \alpha$. Now $\kappa, f \in \mathrm{Hull}_1^N(X)$. Let $H = \mathrm{cHull}_1^N(X)$ and let $\bar\kappa, \bar f \in H$ be the collapses of κ, f. One can show

$$\nu(F^H) = [\{\bar\kappa\}, \bar f]^H_{F^H}.$$

Therefore H is non-tame.

(b) Let

$$\psi : \mathrm{Ult}(M, F^M) \to \mathrm{Ult}(R, F^R)$$

be induced by $i^{\mathcal{T}}$; i.e.,

$$\psi([a,f]^M_{F^M}) = [i^{\mathcal{T}}(a), i^{\mathcal{T}}(f)]^R_{F^R}.$$

We need to see that ψ is continuous at $\nu(F^M)$. So let $\gamma < \psi(\nu(F^M))$. Let $b, g \in R$ be such that $\gamma = [b,g]^R_{F^R}$. Because $\mathcal{T}$ is only 0-maximal, there are $a, f \in M$ such that $(b,g) = i^{\mathcal{T}}(f)(a)$. Therefore there are $h \in M$ and $\alpha < \nu(F^R)$ such that

$$\gamma \in i_{F^R} \circ i^{\mathcal{T}}(h) \text{“} \alpha^{<\omega}.$$

There is $\beta < \nu(F^M)$ such that $\alpha < i^{\mathcal{T}}(\beta)$. It follows that

$$\gamma \in \psi(i_{F^M}(h) \text{“} \beta^{<\omega}).$$

We may assume

$$i_{F^M}(h) \text{“} \beta^{<\omega} \subseteq \nu(F^M).$$

But $\nu(F^M)$ is regular in $\mathrm{Ult}(M, F^M)$, so $i_{F^M} \text{“} \beta^{<\omega}$ is bounded in $\nu(F^M)$. It follows that $\gamma < \nu(F^R)$, as required. □

Theorem 4.5. *Let $Z = M_{\mathrm{nt}}|\Lambda$ where Λ is a limit cardinal of M_{nt}.*

Let $\eta < \Lambda$ be a Z-cardinal. Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be the sup of all $\delta \leq \eta$ such that δ is Woodin in Z. Let $\gamma < \Lambda$. Then $\mathfrak{c}$ is a cutpoint of $Z|\eta$ and $Z \models$ "$Z|\eta$ is above-$\mathfrak{c}$, γ-iterable".

Therefore $\mathbb{E}^Z$ is definable over Z.

Proof. Let Σ be the $(\omega, \omega_1 + 1)$-strategy for M_{nt}. Let $N = Z|\eta$. Let Σ_N be the strategy induced by Σ for above-$\mathfrak{c}$ trees on N. We will show that $\Gamma = \Sigma_N \restriction Z$ is definable over Z from N, uniformly in η and Λ, which clearly suffices. Because the iteration strategies we need are unique, as they must be Q-structure guided, it's easy to see that we may assume that $\Lambda = \kappa = \mathrm{cr}(F^{M_{\mathrm{nt}}})$, so we do this.

We claim that in Z, Γ is just the "above-$M(\mathcal{T})$ iterable Q-structure" strategy; clearly this suffices. So let $\mathcal{T} \in Z$ be a normal, limit length, above-$\mathfrak{c}$ tree on N, via Γ. Let $b = \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$. Then working in $Z = M_{\mathrm{nt}}|\kappa$, let $\mathbb{C} = \langle N_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha \leq \lambda}$ be the maximal fully backgrounded $L[\mathbb{E}]$-construction above $N_0 = M(\mathcal{T})$, with the condition that all background extenders E are such that $E \in \mathbb{E}^Z$ and $\mathrm{cr}(E) > \delta(\mathcal{T})$, and where λ is least such that either $\lambda = \kappa$ or N_λ is a Q-structure for $M(\mathcal{T})$. (Here each N_α is a premouse extending $M(\mathcal{T})$, not just an $M(\mathcal{T})$-premouse.)

Suppose $\lambda < \kappa$. Then N_λ is a Q-structure for $M(\mathcal{T})$, and moreover, N can then use N_λ to determine b, as required.

Now suppose that $\lambda = \kappa$; we will reach a contradiction. Let $F = F(M_{\mathrm{nt}})$, let $R = i_F(N_\kappa)$, let $\delta = \nu(F)$, let $G = F \restriction R \times \delta^{<\omega}$, let

$$U = \mathrm{Ult}(R|(\kappa^+)^R, G),$$

let $S = U|(\delta^+)^U$, let G' be the trivial completion of G, and let $Q = (S, G')$.

Claim. *Q is a $(0, \omega_1 + 1)$-iterable non-tame premouse.*

Using the claim, we can easily complete the proof. For $P \triangleleft Q$ and OR^P is Woodin in Q. So comparing Q with the tame sound Q-structure extending P leads to contradiction, using 4.4(b).

Proof of Claim. In this proof we write $\delta(P)$ to denote $\mathrm{lgcd}(P)$, for premice P.

Non-tameness and the ISC for Q is via the usual proof that Woodinness is absorbed by $L[\mathbb{E}]$-constructions. For iterability, let $\mathcal{T}$ be a 0-maximal tree on Q. We will lift $\mathcal{T}$ to a 0-maximal tree $\mathcal{T}'$ on M_{nt}, using a variant of the lift/resurrect procedure of [3, §12]. We assume the reader is familiar with that procedure, and just explain the differences. The differences arise because Q is not built by a standard $L[\mathbb{E}]$-construction: S is built by $i_F(\mathbb{C})$ in $\mathrm{Ult}(M_{\mathrm{nt}}, F)$, but F^Q is not available to $\mathrm{Ult}(M_{\mathrm{nt}}, F)$.

So, we claim that there is a 0-maximal tree $\mathcal{T}'$ on M_{nt}, and normal trees $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$, such that $\mathcal{T}$ is the stack $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$, and normal trees $\mathcal{U}', \mathcal{W}', \mathcal{V}'$, such that $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{U}' \mathbin{^\frown} \mathcal{W}' \mathbin{^\frown} \mathcal{V}'$, with the properties described below. In outline: We lift $\mathcal{U}$ to $\mathcal{U}'$ via almost the usual procedure. The tree $\mathcal{V}$ begins at the least θ such that the appropriate ancestor for $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta$ is not directly available to $\mathfrak{C}_0(M^{\mathcal{T}'}_\theta)$. We set $\mathcal{W}' = \left\langle F(M^{\mathcal{T}'}_\theta) \right\rangle$, and then lift $\mathcal{V}$ to $\mathcal{V}'$ via the usual procedure.

Let $Q(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}'})$ denote the model defined over $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}'}$ as Q is over $M_{\rm nt}$.

The tree $\mathcal{U}'$ results from lifting/resurrection of $\mathcal{U}$ to $M_{\rm nt}$, except that for each $\alpha < {\rm lh}(\mathcal{U})$, if $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{U}}$ does not drop then the lift of $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}$ is $Q(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'})$, whereas if $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{U}}$ drops then the lift of $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}$ is $\mathfrak{C}_{n_\alpha}(N_{\gamma_\alpha}^{\mathbb{C}_\alpha})$, where

$$\mathbb{C}_\alpha = i^{M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}}_{F(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'})}(i^{\mathcal{U}'}_{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{C})),$$

$\gamma_\alpha < {\rm lh}(\mathbb{C}_\alpha)$, and $n_\alpha = \deg^{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha)$. So the lift is in ${\rm Ult}(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}, F(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}))$, but may not be in $M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}$. Likewise for partial resurrections. Resurrection, if necessary, is computed in ${\rm Ult}(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}, F(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}))$.

We choose $\mathcal{U}$ as long as possible such that for all $\alpha+1 < {\rm lh}(\mathcal{U})$,

(i) if $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{U}}$ does not drop then either $E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathfrak{C}_0(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}})$ or $E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}} = F(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}})$, and

(ii) letting $E^* = E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}$, the ancestor of the lift of $E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}}$, either $E^* \in \mathfrak{C}_0(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'})$ or $E^* = F(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'})$ (the latter occurs just when $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{U}}$ does not drop and $E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}} = F(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}})$).

Let $\beta = {\rm pred}^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha+1)$ and $k = \deg^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha+1)$. Let

$$\sigma : M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}} \to \mathfrak{C}_k(N_\eta^{\mathbb{C}_\beta})$$

be the partial resurrection at stage β determined by ${\rm cr}(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}})$. If $\mathfrak{C}_k(N_\eta^{\mathbb{C}_\alpha}) \in \mathfrak{C}_0(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'})$ or $\mathfrak{C}_k(N_\eta^{\mathbb{C}_\alpha}) = \mathfrak{C}_0(Q(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}))$ then we define $\pi_{\alpha+1}$ in the usual way, via the shift lemma. Suppose otherwise. Then

$${\rm Ult}_0({\rm Ult}_0(M_\beta^{\mathcal{U}'}, F(M_\beta^{\mathcal{U}'})), E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}) = {\rm Ult}_0(M_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{U}'}, F(M_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{U}'}))$$

and the ultrapower maps commute. Let

$$j : {\rm Ult}_0(M_\beta^{\mathcal{U}'}, F(M_\beta^{\mathcal{U}'})) \to {\rm Ult}_0(M_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{U}'}, F(M_{\alpha+1}^{\mathcal{U}'}))$$

be the ultrapower map (given by $E_\alpha^{\mathcal{U}'}$). Then we define $\pi_{\alpha+1}$ in the usual way, except that j replaces $i^{\mathcal{U}'}_{\beta,\alpha+1}$.

Note that by our choice of $\mathcal{U}$, the first drop in model along any $\mathcal{U}$-branch is to some $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}} \triangleleft \mathfrak{C}_0(M_\beta^{\mathcal{U}})$, where $\beta = {\rm pred}^{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha+1)$. So $M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}} \in {\rm dom}(\pi_\beta)$. (But the resurrection of $\pi_\beta(M_{\alpha+1}^{*\mathcal{U}})$ may not be in $M_\beta^{\mathcal{U}'}$.)

If $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$ then ${\rm lh}(\mathcal{U}') = {\rm lh}(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{W}', \mathcal{V}' = \emptyset$.

Suppose $\mathcal{V} \neq \emptyset$. Then ${\rm lh}(\mathcal{U})$ is a successor $\theta+1$, and either (i) or (ii) above fails for $\alpha = \theta$. Let $F = F(M_\theta^{\mathcal{U}'})$ and $\lambda = i_F({\rm cr}(F))$. We set $\mathcal{W}' = \langle F\rangle$, and let $\mathcal{U}' \mathbin{^\frown} \mathcal{W}'$ be 0-maximal. Index $\mathcal{T}'$ as

$$(0, 1, \ldots, \theta, \theta*, \theta+1, \ldots).$$

Let $M = M_\theta^{\mathcal{U}'}$. Then

$$M_{\theta*}^{\mathcal{T}'}|\lambda = {\rm Ult}(M, F)|\lambda$$

and $i^{\mathcal{T}'}_{0,\theta *}(\mathbb{C}) = C_\theta$. Suppose (i) fails for $\alpha = \theta$. Let

$$\psi : \mathrm{Ult}(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\theta, F(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\theta)) \to Q(\mathrm{Ult}(M, F))$$

be induced by π_θ, through the shift lemma, and let $E^* = \psi(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\theta)$. By 4.4(b), $\psi(\delta(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\theta)) = \delta(M^{\mathcal{U}'}_\theta)$, so $\delta(M^{\mathcal{U}'}_\theta) < \mathrm{lh}(E)$. If instead (i) holds, use $\psi = \pi_\theta$ to lift $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\theta$ to an extender E^*. In either case let $E^{\mathcal{T}'}_{\theta *}$ be the ancestor of E^*, according to $\mathbb{C}_\theta$. Note that $\mathrm{lh}(F) < \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}'}_{\theta *}) < \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}'}_{\theta *})$.

Let σ be the map resurrecting E^* to $E^{\mathcal{T}'}_{\theta *}$. Let $\gamma \in \mathrm{OR}$ be least such that $\sigma(\psi(\gamma)) \geq \delta(M^{\mathcal{U}'}_\theta)$. Then γ is a limit cardinal cutpoint of $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta)$. For the limit cardinality is clear; and if $G \in \mathbb{E}_+(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta))$ overlaps γ then the ancestor G' of $\sigma(\psi(G))$ is such that $\mathrm{cr}(G') < \delta(M^{\mathcal{U}'}_\theta) < \mathrm{lh}(G')$, contradicting the tameness of $\mathrm{Ult}(M, F)|\lambda$. Also, $\gamma < \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta)$.

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the remainder of $\mathcal{T}$, so $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{U}^\frown\mathcal{V}$. Then by the previous paragraph, $\mathcal{V}$ is on $M^{\mathcal{U}}_\theta$ and is above γ. We lift $\mathcal{V}$ to a normal tree $\mathcal{V}'$ on $M^{\mathcal{T}'}_{\theta *}$, above $\delta(M^{\mathcal{T}'}_\theta)$. For this we use the standard process; we need not lift to any $Q(M^{\mathcal{V}'}_\alpha)$. For if $[0,\theta]_{\mathcal{T}}$ does not drop and $\alpha + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$ is such that $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha+1) = \theta$, then $\mathcal{T}$ drops in model at $\alpha + 1$. For $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta)$ has cardinality $\leq \gamma$ in $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta$; if (i) fails this is because $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta) < \nu(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta)$ and $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\theta)$ lifts/resurrects to a structure $\mathfrak{C}_{n_\theta}(N^{\mathbb{C}_\theta}_{\gamma_\theta})$, and for some $\alpha > \gamma_\theta$, $N^{\mathbb{C}_\theta}_\alpha$ projects below $\delta(M^{\mathcal{T}'}_\theta)$.

We leave the remaining details to the reader. □(Claim) (4.5)

Remark 4.6. The preceding proof used the fact that $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$. So the following demonstrates that the method easily fails for non-tame mice. It is a simple variant of an observation possibly due to Steel; see [10, 1.1].

Proposition 4.7. *Suppose:*

- *N is a countable premouse satisfying* ZFC*,*
- *Σ is an $(\omega, \omega_1 + 1)$-strategy for N,*
- *$P \triangleleft N$ and P is active,*
- *$\mathrm{cr}(E') < \tau < \delta < \mathrm{OR}^P \leq \eta < (\tau^+)^N$,*
- *τ is a cardinal of N,*
- *$P \models$ "δ is Woodin", and*
- *η is a cutpoint of N.*

Let Σ' be the strategy induced by Σ, for trees $\mathcal{T}$ on P such that $\mathcal{T}$ is in N, is 0-maximal, above τ, and of length $\leq (\tau^+)^N$.

Then $\Sigma' \notin N$.

Proof. For simplicity we assume that $\delta < \nu_E$. The argument in this case can be adapted to the case that $\delta = \nu_E$, using part of the argument for 4.4.

Suppose $\Sigma' \in N$. Let κ be the least measurable of P such that $\kappa > \tau$. Let $\mathbb{B}$ be the δ-generator extender algebra of P at δ, using extenders E with $\mathrm{cr}(E) > \kappa$. Working in N, let $\mathcal{T}$ be the tree given by first linearly iterating a normal measure on κ out past η and then making $N|\eta$ generic for $i^{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbb{B})$ over $\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}}$. Let $E = F(\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}})$. Then $\mathrm{Ult}(N, E)$ is wellfounded since $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$, and $N|\eta$ is generic over $\mathrm{Ult}(N, E)$. Let $Q \trianglelefteq N$ be least such that $\rho_\omega^Q = \tau$ and $i^{\mathcal{T}}(\delta) \leq \mathrm{OR}^Q$. Then

$$Q \notin \mathrm{Ult}(N, E)[N|\eta]$$

since δ is a cardinal in $\mathrm{Ult}(N, E)[N|\eta]$. But

$$Q \in \mathrm{Ult}(N, E)[N|\eta]$$

as in the proof of [10, 1.1], contradiction. □(4.7)

Non-tame mice might still satisfy "$V = \mathrm{HOD}$"; this is unknown for M_{adr}, for example. The following question is also open:

Question 4.8 (Steel)**.** *Suppose M is a mouse satisfying* ZFC*. Does $\lfloor M \rfloor$ satisfy "$V = \mathrm{HOD}_X$ for some $X \subseteq \omega_1^M$"?*

Some further progress toward this problem will be given in [12].

5. Mixed bicephali

In this section we use $\delta(P) = \delta^P$ to denote $\mathrm{lgcd}(P)$.

Definition 5.1. A *mixed bicephalus* is a structure (N, E_2, E_3), where (N, E_2) is a type 2 premouse and (N, E_3) is a type 1 or type 3 premouse.

A *mis-bicephalus* is a structure (N, E_2, E_s), where (N, E_2) is a type 2 premouse and (N, E_s) is a segmented-premouse.[25] ⊣

In this section, we rule out the existence of an iterable mixed bicephalus. This case was not considered in [3, §9] (considering it was unnecessary).

Remarks similar to those in 2.9, regarding fine structure and ultrapowers, also apply to mis-bicephali. Moreover, ultrapowers of such are always constructed at the unsquashed level. This works like for type 2 bicephali in [3, §9].

Definition 5.2. Let N be a mixed bicephalus. The *maximal iteration game on N* is defined as usual, except that for $\alpha + 1 < \mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$: Set $\nu_\alpha = \nu(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$, unless $[0, \alpha]_{\mathcal{T}}$ does not drop and $E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}} = E_s(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$. In the latter case, if (a) $\delta(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}) < \nu(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$, then player II wins, and if (b) $\delta(M_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}}) \geq \nu(E_\alpha^{\mathcal{T}})$, then (player

[25] "mis-" abbreviates "mixed segmented-". *Segmented-premouse* is defined in 2.8.

II has not yet won and) we set $\nu_\alpha = \delta^N$.[26] Then $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha+1)$ is the least β such that $\mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) < \nu_\beta$.

We say N is *α-iterable* iff player II has a winning strategy in the maximal game on N of length α. $\dashv$

We will observe that if N is a mixed bicephalus, then 5.2(a) never attains (whether or not N is iterable).

Theorem 5.3. *There is no $(0,\omega_1+1)$-iterable mixed bicephalus.*

From now on we write *bicephalus* for *mis-bicephalus*.

Proof. Suppose P is otherwise. We may assume P is countable. As in §9 of [3], we compare P with itself, producing padded 0-maximal trees $\mathcal{T},\mathcal{U}$. For $\alpha+1<\mathrm{lh}(\mathcal{T})$, say $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is *$\mathcal{T}$-special* iff $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{T}}$ does not drop and $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$. We may and do require that if $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is $\mathcal{T}$-special then $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$. Likewise for $\mathcal{U}$.

We claim that the comparison fails. This is as in [3, §9], but we discuss a detail not discussed there. Suppose the comparison succeeds, with $Q = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{T}} \trianglelefteq R = \mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{U}}$. Then $b^{\mathcal{T}}$ drops (otherwise $E^Q_2 \neq E^Q_s$ since $E^P_2 \neq E^P_3$). In [3], it is argued that therefore Q is unsound, so $Q = R$, so $b^{\mathcal{U}}$ drops, and standard fine structure leads to contradiction. The appeal to fine structure assumes that enough extenders used in $\mathcal{T},\mathcal{U}$ are close to the models to which they apply. But [3, 6.1.5] was not proven for bicephali. We deal with this by proving:

(∗1) If $[0,\delta+1]_{\mathcal{T}}$ drops, then $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta$ is close to $(M^*_{\delta+1})^{\mathcal{T}}$; likewise for $\mathcal{U}$.[27]

Suppose that $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is $\mathcal{T}$-special. Let $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$. If $\gamma \in [0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{T}}$ is least such that $\gamma=\alpha$ or $\mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma,\alpha}) > \mathrm{cr}(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma))$, then $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma))$. So for $\delta<\gamma$, we have $\nu^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta < \kappa$, and if $\gamma<\alpha$, then $\kappa < \mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma,\alpha}) < \nu^{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma$. Therefore $\mathrm{pred}^{\mathcal{T}}(\alpha+1)=\gamma$ and $\mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) = \mathrm{cr}(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma))$.

Applying this to all $\mathcal{T}$-special extenders, we get:

(∗2) If $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is $\mathcal{T}$-special, and γ is as above, and $\delta+1 \in (\gamma,\alpha]_{\mathcal{T}}$, then $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta$ is not $\mathcal{T}$-special.

It follows that if $[0,\delta+1]_{\mathcal{T}}$ drops, then either $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta) < \mathrm{OR}(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta)$, or $[0,\delta]_{\mathcal{T}}$ drops. Using this, and the argument of [3, 6.1.5], (∗1) follows.

We examine the generators of the $\mathcal{T}$-special extenders. Given a premouse M and a short extender E semi-close to M, let $\varrho(E)$ denote the least $\varrho \geq (\mathrm{cr}(E)^+)^M$ such that $E\restriction\varrho \notin \mathrm{Ult}_0(M,E)$ and $E\restriction\varrho$ is not type Z.

If M is a premouse and $E \in \mathbb{E}^M_+$, then $\varrho(E)=\nu(E)$. Suppose $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{T}}$ is non-dropping. Then $\varrho(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)) = \sup i^{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\alpha}\text{“}\delta(P)$. Moreover,

$$\varrho(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)) < \nu(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha))$$

[26] Steve Jackson noticed that we could have instead set $\nu_\alpha = \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$ in all cases.

[27] Establishing "closeness" in general would require consideration of $\Sigma_1^{(M,E_2,E_s)}$ in the language using both F,G, which we prefer to avoid. We could alternatively make do with semi-closeness, using 2.20, but we also need the consequences of the proof of (∗1) later.

iff there is $\beta \in [0,\alpha)_{\mathcal{T}}$ such that

$$i^{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\alpha}\text{“}\delta(P) = i^{\mathcal{T}}_{0,\beta}\text{“}\delta(P) \subseteq \mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\beta,\alpha}). \tag{11}$$

In this case, we have that

$$\nu(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)) = \sup_{\gamma<\alpha}(\nu'(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma)), \tag{12}$$

where $\nu'(E) = \nu(E)$ if E is type 2 or type 3, and $\nu'(E) = \mathrm{cr}(E)+1$ if E is type 1. These statements can be proven inductively along the branch $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{T}}$, using 2.10 and (∗2) for the successor case, and $\mathrm{r}\Pi_1$ elementarity in the limit case.

It follows that if $[0,\alpha]_{\mathcal{T}}$ is non-dropping, then $\nu(E_s(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)) \leq \delta(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$, and therefore $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is a bicephalus, and player II does not win through 5.2(a).

So the comparison fails, reaching length ω_1+1. We take a hull and get $\pi : H \to V_\theta$ elementary with H countable. Let $\kappa = \mathrm{cr}(\pi)$. Then $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\kappa \in H$ and $\pi \restriction M^{\mathcal{T}}_\kappa = i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\kappa,\omega_1}$, and likewise with $\mathcal{U}$. Also

$$M^{\mathcal{T}}_\kappa|(\kappa^+)^{M^{\mathcal{T}}_\kappa} = M^{\mathcal{U}}_\kappa|(\kappa^+)^{M^{\mathcal{U}}_\kappa},$$

and the (κ,ω_1) branch extenders derived from $i^{\mathcal{T}}_{\kappa,\omega_1}$ and $i^{\mathcal{U}}_{\kappa,\omega_1}$ are identical. Denote the latter G. We also have $M^{\mathcal{T}}_{\omega_1}|\omega_1 = M^{\mathcal{U}}_{\omega_1}|\omega_1$, so $M^{\mathcal{U}}_{\omega_1}$ agrees with $M^{\mathcal{U}}_{\omega_1}$ about V_{ω_1}.

Let $\alpha+1 = \min(\kappa,\omega_1]_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\beta+1 = \min(\kappa,\omega_1]_{\mathcal{U}}$. So $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$, G and $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta$ measure the same sets and are compatible through $\min(\nu^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha, \nu^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$. Now

$$\varrho(G) = \varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) \leq \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) \leq \nu^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha.$$

Likewise for $\mathcal{U},\beta$, so $\varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) = \varrho(G) = \varrho(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$.

Case 1. $\nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) = \varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) = \varrho(G) = \varrho(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta) = \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$.

If $\alpha=\beta$, then also $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) = \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$, so the compatibility implies $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta = E^{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha$, contradiction. So assume $\alpha<\beta$. Then $\nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta) < \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) < \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$, and $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$ is a cardinal in $M^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta|\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$, so $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta$ is indexed too late for a premouse, so is $\mathcal{U}$-special. So $M^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta$ has form $(N, E_2, E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$, and by our rules on using $\mathcal{U}$-special extenders, $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta \neq \emptyset$. So $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta|\mathrm{OR}^N$ is active.

Now OR^N is a cardinal of $\mathrm{Ult}_0(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta, E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$. But $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha \restriction \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) = E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta \restriction \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$ and $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha|\kappa = M^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta|\kappa$. So $\mathrm{Ult}_0(M^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha, E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$ and $M^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha+1}$ agree with $\mathrm{Ult}_0(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta, E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$ past OR^N+1, and agree with $M^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta$ strictly below OR^N. But then for all $\gamma \in (\alpha,\beta)$, $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\gamma = \emptyset$. So $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta = M^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha+1}$, so $M^{\mathcal{T}}_\beta|\mathrm{OR}^N$ is passive, contradiction.

Case 2. $\varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) < \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$.

By the case hypothesis, $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is $\mathcal{T}$-special. We digress for a moment.

Definition 5.4. Let E be a short extender, semi-close to N. For $\varrho \leq \nu(E)$, we say $E \restriction \varrho$ is a *natural segment of* E iff either (i) $\varrho = 0$, or (ii) $\varrho \geq (\mathrm{cr}(E)^+)^N$ and $\nu(E \restriction \varrho) = \varrho$ and

$$\mathcal{P}(\varrho) \cap \mathrm{Ult}_0(N,E) = \mathcal{P}(\varrho) \cap \mathrm{Ult}_0(N, E \restriction \varrho).$$

Now let the *segmentation* of E be

$$S = \{\varrho \parallel E \restriction \varrho \text{ is a natural segment of } E\}.$$

For $\sigma, \varrho \in S$ with $\sigma \leq \varrho$ let

$$j_{\sigma,\varrho} : \mathrm{Ult}_0(N, E \restriction \sigma) \to \mathrm{Ult}_0(N, E \restriction \varrho)$$

be the factor embedding, and if $\sigma < \varrho$, let $\kappa_\sigma = \mathrm{cr}(j_{\sigma,\varrho})$. If $\varrho = \min(S \backslash (\sigma+1))$, let G_σ be the (κ_σ, ϱ) extender derived from $j_{\sigma,\varrho}$. We call the extenders G_σ the *natural factors* of E. $\dashv$

If N is a premouse and $E = F^N$, then clearly $S = \{0, \nu(E)\}$. If $E = E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha'}$ is $\mathcal{T}$-special, then $\varrho(E) = \min(S \backslash \{0\})$. Let $\beta \in [0, \alpha']_{\mathcal{T}}$ be least as in line (11) (with α' replacing α). Then $S \backslash \{0\}$ consists of those ordinals ϱ of either the form $\varrho = \varrho(E)$, or the form $\varrho = \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta)$ for some δ such that $\delta + 1 \in (\beta, \alpha']_{\mathcal{T}}$. Moreover,

$$G_0 = E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha'} \restriction \varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha'})$$

and if $\sigma \in S \backslash \{0\}$ and there is $\varrho \in S$ such that $\sigma < \varrho$ then

$$G_\sigma = E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta \restriction \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta),$$

where δ is least such that $\delta + 1 \leq_{\mathcal{T}} \alpha'$ and $\mathrm{cr}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta) \geq \sigma$. Further, $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta$ is not $\mathcal{T}$-special. These remarks follow from the calculations in [17, 4.3 and following Remark] using fact (∗2) and 2.22, much as in the proof of 2.30.

We now continue with Case 2. Let $S = \langle \varrho_\xi \rangle_{\xi < \omega_1}$ be the segmentation of G and let $\langle G_\sigma \rangle_{\sigma \in S}$ be the sequence of natural factors of G. This sequence is just the concatenation of the sequences of natural factors of the extenders $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\delta$ for $\delta + 1 \in (\kappa, \omega_1]_{\mathcal{T}}$. Likewise for the natural factors of the extenders $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\delta$ for $\delta + 1 \in (\kappa, \omega_1]_{\mathcal{U}}$.

We have $\varrho_0 = 0$ and $\varrho_1 = \varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha) < \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha)$, and $E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ is $\mathcal{T}$-special. So

$$G_{\varrho_0} = E^{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha \restriction \varrho_1 = E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta \restriction \varrho_1$$

and there is γ_0 such that $E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}$ is non-$\mathcal{T}$-special and $\varrho_2 = \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0})$ and

$$G_{\varrho_1} = E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0} \restriction \varrho_2.$$

Now if $\varrho_1 < \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$ then there is γ' such that $E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma'}$ is non-$\mathcal{U}$-special and $\varrho_2 = \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma'})$ and

$$G_{\varrho_1} = E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma'} \restriction \varrho_2,$$

but then $(M^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0} || \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}), E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0})$ is a premouse, and likewise for $E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma'}$, so $E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0} = E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma'}$, contradiction. So $\varrho_1 = \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_\beta)$.

Now let $\alpha_0 = \alpha$ and $\beta_0 = \beta$ and

$$\beta_1 + 1 = \min((\beta_0 + 1, \omega_1]_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

So $\varrho_2 = \varrho(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1})$ and

$$G_{\varrho_1} = E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1} \restriction \varrho_2.$$

Now like before, $\varrho_1 < \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1})$ (here if $\mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}) < \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1})$, use the argument from Case 1). So there is a non-$\mathcal{U}$-special $E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\delta_1}$ such that $\varrho_3 = \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\delta_1})$ and

$$G_{\varrho_2} = E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\delta_1} \restriction \varrho_3.$$

But then as before,

$$G_{\varrho_2} = E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_2} \restriction \varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_2})$$

for some $\mathcal{T}$-special $E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_2}$ with $\varrho(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_2}) < \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_2})$. So by (∗2), $E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_0}$ has only two natural factors, G_{ϱ_0} and G_{ϱ_1}.

This pattern continues through ω stages, producing a sequence of overlapping $\mathcal{T}$- and $\mathcal{U}$-special extenders $E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_{2i}}$ and $E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_{2i+1}}$, for $i < \omega$, each having exactly two natural factors. The natural factors of $E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_{2i}}$ are $G_{\varrho_{2i}}$ and $G_{\varrho_{2i+1}}$; the natural factors of $E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_{2i+1}}$ are $G_{\varrho_{2i+1}}$ and $G_{\varrho_{2i+2}}$.

For $i < \omega$ let $\kappa_i = \mathrm{cr}(G_{\varrho_i})$ and $F_{2i} = E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha_{2i}}$. So $\kappa_{2i} = \mathrm{cr}(F_{2i})$. The next claim shows that $M^{\mathcal{T}}_{\omega_1}$ is illfounded, a contradiction.

Claim 1. *For each $i < \omega$ we have $i_{F_{2i}}(\kappa_{2i}) > \kappa_{2i+2}$.*

Proof. We will take $i = 0$ for simplicity, but the general case is similar. We have

$$E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0} \restriction \nu(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}) = G_{\varrho_1} = E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1} \restriction \varrho(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1}),$$

and $\varrho_2 = \varrho(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1}) < \nu(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1})$. Let $\zeta <_{\mathcal{U}} \beta_1$ be least such that $\varrho_2 \leq \mathrm{cr}(i^{\mathcal{U}}_{\zeta,\beta_1})$. Then $\gamma_0 \geq \zeta$ because otherwise there is some extender used along $[0,\zeta]_{\mathcal{U}}$ which sends its critical point $> \varrho_2$, but then $\varrho(E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\beta_1}) > \varrho_2$, a contradiction. And $\varrho_2 = \nu(E_s(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta))$ and

$$E_s(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta) \restriction \varrho_2 = G_{\varrho_1}.$$

So $E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}$ and $E_s(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta)$ are essentially the same extender. Therefore

$$M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta || \mathrm{OR}(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta) = \mathrm{Ult}(M^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}, E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}) || \mathrm{OR}(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta),$$

which implies that $E^{\mathcal{U}}_\xi = \emptyset$ for all $\xi \in [\zeta, \gamma_0)$, so $M^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma_0} = M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta$, and implies that either

$$\mathrm{lh}(E_s(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta)) = \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}) \ \ \& \ \ E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma_0} = E_2(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta)$$

or

$$\mathrm{lh}(E_s(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta)) > \mathrm{lh}(E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0}) \ \ \& \ \ E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma_0} = \emptyset = E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\gamma_0+1} \ \ \& \ \ E^{\mathcal{U}}_{\gamma_0+1} = E_2(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta).$$

Note that, in any case, letting $F = E_s(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta)$, we have

$$i_{G_{\varrho_1}}(\kappa_1) = i_F(\kappa_1) > \delta(M^{\mathcal{U}}_\zeta) \geq \kappa_2.$$

The fact that $i_F(\kappa_1) > \delta(M_\zeta^{\mathcal{U}})$ is because F is not of superstrong type, which is because E_3^N is not of superstrong type (this is easily preserved under iteration). The last inequality is because

$$\kappa_2 = \mathrm{cr}(E_{\delta_1}^{\mathcal{U}}) < \nu(E_2(M_\zeta^{\mathcal{U}})).$$

This completes the proof of the claim (in the case that $i = 0$). □

This completes Case 2, and by symmetry, the proof. □

As a corollary, we have the following result on uniqueness of maximal $L[\mathbb{E}]$-constructions:

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose V is sufficiently countably iterable in some possibly larger universe V'. Let $\mathbb{C} = \langle N_\alpha \rangle_{\alpha \leq \lambda}$ be an $L[\mathbb{E}]$-construction, with sufficient total background extenders. Suppose there are extenders E, F such that $M = (N_\lambda, E)$ and $N = (N_\lambda, F)$ are premice, and there are sufficient total background extenders for M and N. Then $E = F$.*[28]

Proof Sketch. Suppose not. Work in V'. By taking a countable hull, we may assume V is countable. By [3, §9, §12], $B = (N_\lambda, E, F)$ is a mixed bicephalus. But B is $(0, \omega_1 + 1)$-iterable, by the proof in [3, §12]. This contradicts 5.3. □

Bibliography

References

[1] Kenneth Kunen. Some applications of iterated ultrapowers in set theory. *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 1(2):179–227, 1970.

[2] William Mitchell, Ernest Schimmerling, and John R. Steel. The covering lemma up to a Woodin cardinal. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 84(2):219–255, 1997.

[3] William Mitchell and John R. Steel. *Fine structure and iteration trees*. Number 3 in Lectures Notes in Logic. Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[4] William J. Mitchell. Sets constructed from sequences of ultrafilters. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 39(1):57–66, 1974.

[5] William J. Mitchell. Sets constructed from sequences of measures: revisited. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 48(3):600–609, 1983.

[6] Ernest Schimmerling. Combinatorial principles in the core model for one Woodin cardinal. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 74(2):153–201, 1995.

[28] We leave the precise interpretation of "sufficient" to the reader; it should be enough to guarantee the $(0, \omega_1 + 1)$-iterability of B in the proof. "Countably iterable" means that countable hulls are $(\omega_1 + 1)$-iterable.

[7] Ernest Schimmerling and John R. Steel. Fine structure for tame inner models. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 61(2):621–639, 1996.

[8] Ernest Schimmerling and John R. Steel. The maximality of the core model. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 351(8):3119–3141, 1999.

[9] Ralf Schindler. Core models in the presence of Woodin cardinals. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 71(4):1145–1154, 2006.

[10] Ralf Schindler and John Steel. The self-iterability of $L[E]$. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 74(3):751–779, 2009.

[11] Ralf Schindler, John R. Steel, and Martin Zeman. Deconstructing inner model theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 67(2):721–736, 2002.

[12] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Analysis of measures. To appear.

[13] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Reconstructing copying and condensation. To appear, available at https://sites.google.com/site/schlutzenberg/home-1/research/papers-and-preprints.

[14] Farmer Schlutzenberg. *Measures in mice*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2007. Arxiv: 1301.4702.

[15] Farmer Schlutzenberg. Homogeneously Suslin sets in tame mice. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 77(4):1122–1146, 2012.

[16] John R. Steel. Projectively well-ordered inner models. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 74(1):77–104, 1995.

[17] John R. Steel. *The core model iterability problem*. Number 8 in Lecture Notes in Logic. Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[18] John R. Steel. An outline of inner model theory. In Matthew Foreman and Akihiro Kanamori, editors, *Handbook of set theory*, volume 3, chapter 19. Springer, first edition, 2010.